there can be a common discussion on both the items. Thereafter the Bill cas be passed. I would like you to consider my suggestion that these two subjects may be discussed together. of course, subject to the consent of the Minister of Finance.

SHRI JAGESH DESAI: Sir, these are two separate issues. One is to be decided by the Business Advisory Committee. And this Bill is to brought by the Government. Though the subject, to some extent, may be the same, it may be taken separately. If time for the Sick Industrial Companies Bill can be reduced, that can be considered.

THE VICE CHAIRMAN (DR. NAGEN SAIKIA): We shall take up both the subjects in accordance with the preference given in the business list.

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह : मान्यवर, एक व्यवस्था का सवाल है, इसी पर । यह है कि पब्लिक सैक्टर अंडरटेकिंस करीब-करीब 264–265 हैं अपने देश में ... (व्यवधान) स्टेटमेंट की जरूरत है, चूंकि इसमें कई विभाग हैं । .. (व्यवधान)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (DR. NAGEN SAIKIA): I am not going to allow you. Please sit down.

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह : पब्लिक सैक्टर में एग्रीकल्चर है, इंडस्ट्रीज हैं, कैमिकल्स हैं । इसमें करीब-करीब दसों विभाग हैं, जिसमें पब्लिक सैक्टर काम कर रहे हैं । ... (व्यवधान)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (DR. NAGEN SAIKIA): I am not permitting you I am not going to listen to you. When your turn comes, you make your point.

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह : मान्यवर, मेरी बात तो सुनिए, जितने विभाग के पब्लिक सैक्टर अंडरटेकिंग हैं उनसे संबंधित मिनिस्टर यहां होने चाहिए, ताकि वे हमें सुनकर जवाब दें । ... (व्यवधान)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (DR. NAGEN SAIKIA): The Minister is there. Government representatives are there. Four Ministers are there. Please take your seat.

SHRI MURLIDHAR CHANDRAKANT BHANDARE: I think, he wants the whole Cabinet here.

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह : एग्रीकल्चर विभाग है, तो यह क्या जवाब देंगे ? जितने भी पब्लिक सैक्टर कंट्रोल करते हैं, उनको यहां बुलाईए, ताकि हमारी बातें सुनें । अगर वे हमारी बात आमने-सामने सुनें तो उनके दिमाग में ज्यादा बात आयेंगी ।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (DR. NAGEN SAIKIA): If you kill your time like that, your time will be deducted from the alloted time. Please don't interrupt; Yes, Mr: Gurudas Das Gupta.

II. REPORTED MOVE OF THE GOVERNMENT TO CLOSE DOWN A NUMBER OF PUBLIC SECTOR UNDERTAKINGS ON GROUNDS OF SICKNESS.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA (West Bengal): Sir, at the outset let me state that while discussing public sector undertakings, let us discuss it by cutting across party lines and party affiliations. Why do we discuss public sector undertakings? We discuss public sector not because somebody has called it sick. We discuss public sector because public sector happens to be the most important tool in the hands of the State to bring about equitable and balanced social and economic growth in the country. Let me begin the discussion by putting a question to the Government and to the House. Is it possible to discuss the performance of the public sector without discussing the level of economic development of the country... (*interruptions*) ...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (DR. NAGEN SAIKIA): Mr. Gurudas Das Gupta,

[Dr. Nagen Saikia]

time alloted to your party is only 5 minutes. But as you are raising the issue, I will permit you to take maximum 15 minutes and not more than that.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: I cannot conclude it just like that. But I will try to be brief.

The point is, there cannot be a discussion on public sector without discussing the level of economic development, and the programmes which are of national priority. We cannot do it without discussing specific Indian realities and the role a Welfare State has to play in the specific situation that is obtaining in the country at the moment. If you kindly bear with me, the fact remains that despite the advance the country has made during the last 40 years, the planning in the country has failed to make any dent on the poverty and unemployment and deprivation of the masses. If you go by any economic criteria, that is, income generation and employment creation or if you go by any social consideration like providing for the basic needs, it will be very clear that a vast section of the Indian masses remain today totally or mostly marginalised. The strategy of removing unemployment and poverty by 5 per cent growth rate of Gross Domestic Product has failed. Till 1970, the growth rate was 3.5 per cent. Subsequently it accelerated to 5 per cent. But if you look at the structure of Indian growth, it will be very clear that the production of elitist consumption commodities by the capital-intensive private sector has increased. This additional growth of the private sector is of little social significance to the society we are living in. Despite the higher growth rate, the salient features of the Indian economy at the present moment, as you know, are super inflation which we had been discussing yesterday and widespread unemployment—the volume is anywhere between 130 million and 200 million when the population growth in the country is over 2 per cent. the creation of additional job opportunities has declined from 2.88 per cent to less than 1.5 per cent and thanks to the decline most rapidly in the creation of additional job opportunities in the private sector. The point therefor is the most important point, whether the situation can be altered by depending on the private sector for development purposes. The point is, it is not only inflation and unemployment. It is marginalisation of a vast section of the Indian masses. It is unparalleled concentration of wealth. It is growing disparity of income. It is a huge poverty-base in the economy. About inflation, we discussed yesterday and unemployment, we know where it is. Let us come to the method of planning in the country. When the benefit trickled down, mechanism had failed all these years we had formulated direct anti-unemployment and anti-poverty schemes. There was a huge investment in the Seventh Plan but all these anti-unemployment and anti-povery schemes were neglected. You look at the poverty scene. Today, there are about 195 million people below the poverty line in the rural India. According to another estimate, the percentage of poverty in the rural areas is 47.5 per cent and in the urban areas 36.58 per cent.

SHRI JAGESH DESAI (Maharashtra): Mr. Gurudas Das Gupta, because the time is limited, you come to the brass tacks.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: This is very important because we must know in what background the public sector has to play its role. About 1,46,000 villages in the country do not have any source of supply of drinking water or a very little supply of drinking water. The marginalisation of peasantry takes place at the rate of 3.2 per cent. Housing is a dream. Investment in social security is very marginal, even less than many of the Latin American countries in the world. Twenty per cent of the villages are without power. This is the panorama. This is not beating about the bush. It is the panorama. I would like to raise a question. Let me give another example. What is the purchasing power of the people? There has been a survey conducted about the condition of the agricultural poor and landless labour in a leading State of the country. It has indicated that 50 per cent of the

adult women do not have more than one saree; 70 per cent of the adult males do not have two dhotis; 95 per cent of the women do not have any peticoat and 40 per cent of the children go naked.

In this context, I want to raise a point. If you dismantle the National Textiles Corporation—the only public sector unit producing low value textiles—do you believe that the high value producing Reliance or Bombay Dyeing will manufacture Janata dhoti and saree for these destitutes of the country? Therefore, my point is, can the situation be altered if we base our development strategy on profit maximising private sector? Can privation be the panacea or the public sector should be given a commanding role? Because there is a debate and a question has been raised about the efficency of the public sector and that is why this discussion has become necessary. On the question of viability of the public sector, there is no difference of opinion. On the question of the accountability of the public sector, there is no quarrel. But on the question of the state of affairs prevailing in the public sector, I beg to differ with the document that has been published by the Government—the document in glossy white sheets. To me, it appears that it is a blowing up of the crisis. It is not an objective appraisal. It is a canard. It is deliberately done to dislodge the public sector from its position in the economy and dismantle the public sector subsequently. Therefore, I believe the controversy going on in the country is a political game. It is a gamble. It is a biased campaign to change the pattern of the economic development of the country— I do not know at whose behest. Now, I am coming to the condition of the public sector. There are certain commonly accepted economy yardsticks with which you can discuss the viability or the non-viability or the performance of the public sector. First, capacity utilisation. There are in the country 136 public sector units which are utilising more than 75 per cent of their own capacity. There are in the country 58 units which are utilising between 75 and 50%. There are in our country about 60 units whose capacity utilisation is less than 50%. On the question of profitability the entire public sector is being denigrated as if there is no viability, as if the entire system has gone wrong. That is the picture that has been painted. On the question of profitability let me tell you there are 131 public sector units which have been earning profits and if we take the question of investment, over 80% of the investment in the public sector is profit-earning, over 80 to 85%. It may be that 15% of the investment is incurring a loss. When in a particular system more than 85% of the investment is earning profit, how can you say that the entire system has gone sick or wrong? On the question of profitability during 1980-81, the percentage of profit earned by the public sector as a whole, percentage of return on capital investment, was 7.79%. In 1990-91 it is 12.58%. Now tell me: Can 12% return on the capital investment be painted as the performance of a sick unit? (*interruption*). In 1980-81 the total amount of profit of the public sector was negative; it was around Rs. 202 crores. Now in 1990-91, who have retired have got their money or viability of the public sector, in a year when the profit-earning has been the maximum on record, the performance of the public sector so far as profit-making is concerned this year is record-making. The total profit that the public sector has made in our country at the present moment of time is Rs. 3,781.83 crores, after adjusting the losses, after taking care of the losses. This is a record profit. Rs. 3,781.83 crores has been the total profit of the total public sector system after adjusting the losses that were incurred by a number of units.

On the question of sale, the public sector has registered a compound growth rate between 1961 and 1981 to the extent of 19.8%. This is maximising of the sales. This is just opposite to the efficacy of the private sector. In the private sector there are 300 units. The leading units in the private sector in the country have earned 23% of additional profit by increasing the sales to the extent of 13%. In the case of the private sector more price, more

[Shri Gurudas Das Gupta]

profit. In the case of the public sector the situation is just the reverse. What has been the contribution of the public sector towards the growth of domestic capital formation during the Sixth Five Year Plan? During the Sixth Five Year Plan the public sector has contributed to the capital formation to the extent of 49%. Employment generation. In 1978-79—about 17 lakhs of people were employed by the public sector. In 1989-90 it has increased by 5 lakhs. At the present moment of time 22,36,000 is the total volume of employment in the public sector. In regard to export earning, if you want to discuss the question of viability, it has to be a comprehensive analysis. What is the export earning? The public sector had earned export revenue to the extent of Rs. 3,822 crores in 1985-86. Now in 1988-89 it has increased to Rs. 6,365 crores. This is the performance of the so called non-viable public sector units of the country in closing down which the Government is interested at the moment. What is the contribution of the public sector to the national exchequer by way of payment of taxes? While a large number of private sector units are delinquent because they do not pay any statutory dues, the public sector's contribution of the national exchequer this year has been the highest and it has been to the extent of Rs. 18,252 crores. Sir, the tragedy is that we are discussing the viability of the public sector here while its profit has been at a record level and when its contribution to the national exchequer has been the highest in recent times! More than 85 per cent of the investment in the public sector is viable, more than 85 per cent of the so-called non-viable units. According to the statistics given by the Government, 66 per cent of the public sector units which the Government has termed as sick can be revived, can be brought back to health. Therefore, what is the number of units that the present Government with its biased economic policy, has found to be uneconomical? The number is around 40 to 45. I will give you examples to indicate how arbitrary the assessment of the Government is so far as the functioning of the public sector is concerned.

The first instance is that of the MAMC which was set up by the Government during the Second Five Year Plan period for producting machinery for modernization of the collieries. After the nationalisation of the coalfields, Coal India Limited opted for imports on a lavish scale instead of placing orders on the MAMC. Therefore, it starved from the very bepinning and it was a still-born baby from the very beginning. And what is the situation now? Now, it is working up to 50 per cent of its capacity without getting orders from the Coal India Limited and, at the present moment—I had been there to that factory—they are suffering from a resource crunch. They need Rs. 50 crores to meet their immediate requirements and the Government has not given them even the allotment made in the Budget. When an amount of Rs. 50 crores is the minimum requirement, what is the situation now? The outstanding amount due to this unit from the other public sector units is to the tune of Rs. 30 crores. The other public sector units have purchased, but have not paid the money and therefor, there is this resource crunch.

The Government has asked this unit to implement voluntary retirement scheme and about one thousand employees have retired. But the Government has not paid them the money. People have been retired, but they have got their dues. But Mr. Thungon has no time to discuss this matter with us to find out whether the people who have retired have got their money or not because Mr. Manmohan Singh has dried up the resources and that is why this poor MAMC has had to divert its own money and pay at least a part of the employees who have been retired. Therefore, there is this resource crunch which has arisen out of the non-payment by the other public sector units and which has arisen out of Government's inability to pay its own money so far as the retired employees are concerned.

Sir, this is an anarchic situation. But look at the order book of this unit which has been termed as sick..... (*Time Bell*..

Sir, I want you to give me more time because I am raising this discussion and this is not the time allotted to my party. I want some more time.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (DR. NAGEN SAIKIA): Please be brief.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: The total value of the orders pending with this unit at the present moment is Rs. 241 crores and orders worth Rs. 40 crores are on the pipeline. But they do not have the money to carry out those orders and the Government considers it a sick unit! They do not give the money to this unit, the public sector units do not pay their dues, this unit, therefore, is not able to carry out its order, the Government terms it as sick and Mr. Manmohan Singh decides to close it down!

Now, I come to the Ophthalmic Glass Unit. This is the only unit producing Ophthalmic Glass in the whole of the country. We have imported the units from the Soviet Union and I do not know why we thought of importing from the Soviet Union their outdated technology. It is an outdated technology. I must say. I have gone to the factory.

[The Vice-Chairman (Shri Bhaskar Annaji Masodkar]. In the Chair Sir, I was feeling that I was let down by a friend, because 50 per cent of the machinery that was given by the Soviet Union is outdated; it could not be commissioned even for a day. As a result, Sir, two crores of investment has been there. And the total cost of the unit was Rs. 4 crores. And the Government is calculating the loss on the basis of compounding interest of that two crores. Sir, the trade union, the management and the officers met me, and they say: our loss is Rs. 1 crore and 60 lakhs per year, we shall bring it down to Rs. 60 lakhs but the Government must change its policy. What is the policy, Sir The Government asked the opthamic glass unit to increase the production of its commodities. At the same time they decided to allow import of the same commodities from outside. And, therefore, there is crunch and therefore there is the problem. Therefore, that unit can be viable only totally if the Government withdraws its decision to import the same type of commodities that they are producing. It is thus a contradiction of your policy. You are always in two minds. It is because of the contradiction of your policy; the public sector, to the extent it has turned sick, is because of you.

Sir, I have many more examples. I give you one example. The Jute Manufacturing Corporation, West Bengal, employes 30,000 workers. Just imagine sabotaging Government policy. A joint Secretary of the Department of Textiles has written a letter to the management telling them that you must make an analysis and appraisal of your assets a position and make that known to a particular person who was himself a delinquent jute magnet. What is the idea? Because the Government's idea is to make a down-right sale. And for that they wanted the management to tell its assets position to a private sector owner. This is the position in the public sector. Therefore, at the present moment I believe Sir, the public sector is suffering because of the policies that the Government has been following. Government has enough confidence in the private sector. I hope Mr. Thungon knows Tata Consultancy Government have decided to close down Bengal Pottery. But Tata Consultancy, a premier private sector organization, has made an appraisal and submitted a report to the Government saying that Bengal Pottery can be made viable. Despite a categorical, objective analysis of that institution, Government has decided to disband it. What is the reason? The reason is that a very important industrial house is given the licence to produce the same type of ceramics in Uttar Pradesh.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF INDUSTRY (SHRI P. J. KURIEN): It is misleading. Government has not decided to close down...(*Interruptions*). It has de-notified.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: I can tell him. I know better than Mr. Kurien,

[Shri Gurudas Das Gupta]

because I live in that State. Sir, the Government has de-notified. The meaning of de-notification is this, you are nobody. And the employees of Bengal Pottery are getting their salaries because the High Court of Calcutta has given a mandatory order to the Government that it must pay them their salary. Tell me what else it is if it is not closure order. If it is not a death certificate signed by Mr. Kurien and his colleagues then what is it? You de-notify a factory and they get their salary because of the intervention of the High Court. What else it means?

In conclusion, Sir, I must say the sickness that is there in the public sector is because of obsolescence. This is the reason of sickness. Government has been hesitating to invest money from the beginning Therefore, obsolescence arising out of this Government decision is, in the main, responsible for the sickness to the extent it exists in the public sector. Secondly, Sir, totally contradictory Government policies

3.00 P.M.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): Please conclude now.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: I am concluding. Second reason is totally contradictory Government policies. The Government decides to set up a unit at a particular moment. In the next moment, the Government decides to import the same commodity from outside. Sir, there is not only contradictory Government policy, but there is also the arbitrary price fixation of the production of the public sector. And this arbitrary price fixation is done by a unit in Delhi without any relevance whatsoever to the costs. It has nothing to do with the costs. Therefore, the arbitrary price fixation with no relevance to costs is a major factor for the sickness or losses creeping into the public sector in our country. Sir, along with it, there is no coordination. We were in Bombay some time back. My colleague, Mr. Jagesh Desai was with me.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): There are other Members to speak.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: Sir, I am concluding. We asked some of the people, "Why are you purchasing ships from outside?" What was the reply? The representatives of the Vizag Shipyard gave the reply that, "We are not being able to manufacture ships because SAIL do not supply us the steel of the quality we need.

Therefore, Sir, it is the total absence of accountability, it is the total non-monitoring, it is the law productively which is responsible for this catastrophic situation.

Sir, if the Government is to be blamed for the crisis, the trade unions also cannot be absolved themselves of the irresponsibility that has developed in the public sector. Therefore, Sir, what do we want? What is our suggestion? We are not here to mount a blistering attack on the Government. But we should do it because the Government must be brought to its senses. But, what is our suggestion? My first suggestion, Sir, is that there must be a correct appraisal of the situation prevaling in the public sector. The document that you have published is nothing short of calumny because, at the beginning—it tempts me; it is a little digression—in the first page, they have given a detailed study about the Indian Iron and Steel Company Limited in West Bengal. And the total cost they have shown is Rs. 6,525 crores for revival. But do you know, Sir, the Government did not decide about modernisation for five years? And they have already spent Rs. 100 crores to draw out a plan of revival. They have spent for revival, but they have not started revival. In the meantime there has been escalation. Therefore, Sir.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): Your conclusion must follow.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: Therefore, Sir, the point is that before the issue was settled, before the Parliament had discussed the problem, before any policy was decided, there were a number of irresponsible statements. Even the Ministers thought it better to issue a statement in a foreign country while attending the meeting of the World Bank. And this irresponsible statement has sent a wave of panic across the

public sector. Everybody there in the public sector today is demoralised They feel let down. They are haunted by the spectre that it is going to be closed down any moment. Sir, tell me, if this is the psychology in the public sector, can you revive the public sector? And who is responsible for this psychology? It is the Government that is responsible. Therefore, Sir, these statements have made the situation far worse. I believe, Sir, taking a wrong signal, a totally wrong signal from the development in some parts of the Eastern Europe, and being totally pressurised by the World Bank, the Government has started irresponsible action, and they have started confrontation. Otherwise, there could not have been a strike. The strike took place because of confrontation, and confrontation is the outcome of the irresponsibility that the Government has started.

Therefore, Sir, I plead for a policy of national consensus. Let there be national consensus on public sector. I plead that there should be a policy of national interest, not born out of panic but born out of our genuine consideration for economic development. Sir, we want a public sector. But that does not mean that we want the private sector to be throttled. We want a proper integration of the...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): Mr. Gupta, you are going beyond...

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: ...public sector and the private sector.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): Mr. Gupta, you have already taken half an hour.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: In conclusion, Sir, I must say that the Manmohan model is a misfit for the country. Manmohan model is a misfit for the country. We must revive Nehruvian and Mahalanobis policy. I appeal to the Members of the Congress not to forget the legacy of Nehru, not to take the liberty of burying the momory of Mrs. Gandhi's warning; I wish the national legacy is restored, and in order to restore the national legacy, it is essential that the Prime Minister restores the credibility of his Government, and to restore the credibility of the Government, it is important that a national consensus on public sector is built up without castigating the national sector without blowing up the disorder that might have developed and without drawing the working class into confrontation and without taking the line that in order to kill the dog, give it a bad name, Please don't do it. Therefore, I plead with the House. Let us discuss from the broad national angle to ensure that it is the public sector in our country that remains as a working tool for ensuring success in the struggle against poverty and unemployment. Your fight against poverty and unemployment cannot be won if you dislodge and dismantle the public sector and base our strategy on the profit-maximising private sector in the country.

SHRI JAGESH DESAI: First of all, I would like to a sure Shri Gurudas Das Gupta that Congress Party is wedded to the economic policies started by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, Indiraji and Rajivji. We are not going to go back, and our Prime Minister, Narasimha Raoji has said it many times not only in this House but everywhere—and I am pointing it out her —that we are not going to deviate from the path which has been slown by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru...

SHRI CHIMANBHAI MEHTA (Gujarat): Then what is this Manmohan model?

SHRI JAGESH DESAI: One thing I would like to tell Mr. Gurudas Das Gupta after all that he has said that one of the reasons for the sickness in public sector is the inefficiency of the workers in the public sector and also because of the political leaders who instigate the workers to go on strike, and then... (*Interruptions*).

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: Let me say, He is passing on the blame on the working classes, but he does not know that... (*Interruptions*).

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY (Pondicherry): Not working classes, but the Communist leaders.

SHRI JAGESH DESAI: What do you gain by bunds. What is this? (*Interruptions*). There are some industries where one day's bund is there and for 5 or 6 days they cannot have any production. You don't know to what extent you hamper the production in the public sector.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: Strike was forced on the working classes by Mr. Manmohan Singh.

SHRI JAGESH DESAI: What do you gain? We are a strong exponent of the public sector. We want the public sector to attain commanding heights. And we would not go back from that aim. But, Sir, on one thing I agree with Mr. Gurudas Das Gupta. There are many in the bureaucracy; there may be others also, including in my party, who always denigrate the public sector by showing a wrong picture. I have said this in the House earlier also and I want to point out again. I have seen the figures. In 131 units where we are making profit, the capital employed is Rs. 72,130 crores. But the total capital employed in all the public sector undertakings by way of equity is not more than Rs. 35,000 crores. Remaining is by way of loans on which the pubilc sector undertakings are giving interest. Why are you giving this kind of picture? I am not able to understand. I said this in the House 3 or 4 times earlier and today also I repeat that what they have given in the monogrm is there are 131 public sector undertakings which are making profit where the capital emloyed is around Rs. 72,130 crores and their profit is around Rs. 5741 crores, that is, 8 per cent. I have not got the figures of all the public sector undertakings with regard to capital employed; but may be, it is not more than Rs. 30,000 crores, and that being so, the profit that these public sector undertaking are making is 20 per cent. Still, it is denigrated. It is said that the public sector is making losses.

SHRI BHUVNESH CHATURVEDI (Rajasthan): It has social obligations also.

SHRI JAGESH DESAI: That is another thing. Out of these 131 units, 65 units have large social obligations. They are providing houses. They are providing medical facilities. They are running schools. The expenditure on this account is not less than Rs. 1,000 crores every year.

SHRI BHUVNESH CHATURVEDI: Paying all taxes.

SHRI JEGESH DESAI: At the same time, we do not want these units to become sick. What we are discussing today is, as far as the sick units are concerned, to what extent we can help in reviving them. That is the purpse behind this discission. What is the position in regard to some of the units which are making losses. Out of the 98 loss-making units 44-46 units were taken over from the private sector. (*Interruptions*) They completely squeezed these units. They used up the machinery fully. When they found that it cannot yield any milk, they made it obsolete. They siphoned away the funds to the other units which were making profits. The Government had to take over these units in order that the lakhs of workers employed in these units were not rendered jobless.

This is how these units became sick. What should have been done at that time? Take, for example, the Simplex Mills, at Nagpur, owned by the Tatas. When that unit became sick, what should have been done? when a unit is par of an MRTP company, it has to be merged with the healthy unit of that MRTP company, so that this type of burden on the Government is avoided. In future, at least, we have to take this into account, that wherever a unit of an MRTP company...

SHRI CHATURANAN MISHRA (Bihar): Under what law?

SHRI JAGESH DESAI: I will tell you how it can be done. Not by law. I suggest that the financial institutions should stop giving them term loans. If the financial institutions and the banks stop, giving loans to them, they will do it. If the Government adopts this approach, if

the Government has this kind of courage, it can be done. I am sure, in future, the Government will adopt this approach. These people have been exploiting. They have earned profits. They have distributed dividends. Because of this, the poor people of the country have to bear this burden.

I do not want to go into the details. This is one picture. Another aspect is, some of the public sector undertakings are incurring very huge expenditure. Is it not to be curbed? I have some information regarding Coal India. Every year, they spend Rs. 60 crores on air travel alone. They spend Rs. 5 crores on mere cancellation of air tickets. How are you allowing them? Is it the way to work the public sector? The poor people's money cannot be allowed to be squandered like this. When they go out, they stay in five-star hotels. Instead of staying in their own quest houses, they go and stay in these hotels. These are the areas where we have to take action. These are the reasons why the public sector is being denigrated by the people. We are all concerned with this.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: They travel in the executive class.

SHRI JAGESH DESAI: So far as the question of sickness is concerned, later in the evening, we are going to take up a Bill.

SHRI MURLIDHAR CHANDRAKANT BHANDARE (Maharashtra): What is left in that Bill now? Same discussion.

SHRI JAGESH DESAI: Now, in the public sector units, Government directors are there. What are they doingd there? I wuld like to know. What is the department doing. What is the Minister doing? Does the Ministry monitor the reports? Does it monitor whether they attend the Board meetings or not? I know, in most of the cases they do not attend the meetings. Only GMS attend the meetings. Now, you want to refer these sick unit to the BIFR, I do not understand why they want to refer them to the BIFR. I am not able to understand. I would appeal to the Government. Instead of referring the sick public sector units to the BIFR they should refer them to the COPU, Committee on Public Undertakings, where all the parties are represented and when you want to discuss a matter relating to what extent we can close this industry or whether it can be revived, I think the best course would be to refer this to the Public Undertakings Committee. You can call the experts of PFIR in evidence, examine them, go in detail...

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: May I suggest? Will you agree that we ask the Government to set up study teams to make a unit-wise study of the different public undertakings? If some study teams are set up which may include economists, trade union leaders and Members of Parliament and also the management, you will be able to make a unit-wise study. Otherwise, it will be a superficial study.

SHRI JAGESH DESAI: There are different industries. Take for example steel industry. There are 5-6 units which can be taken together. (*Interruptions*) COPU with expert advice can study and give recommendations. Here is a case...

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI (Maharashtra): Would you kindly yield for a minue? I do not mind if you refer it to the COPU or any study team. I was also a member of COPU. I think you were also with me.

SHRI MURLIDHAR CHANDRAKANT BHANDARE: No, I was not there.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: You will be appointed. (*Interruptions*) I have a very serious question. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI MURLIDHAR CHANDRAKANT BHANDARE: I object to this. He looks at me and says that I was a member and I say that I was not.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): Mr. Kulkarni, you are a senior parliamentarian, you must address the Chair, not Mr. Desai.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: There is no question of senior or junior. I just asked him to yield.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): He has yielded.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: Through you I want to draw the attention of Shri Jagesh Desai to one thing. There can be two opinions whether BFIR was competent or not, but about COPU I was a member, I raised this issue because no expertise was available. (*Interruptions*). They say that the Government officers are called and they will inform you and grief you. What is the use of that?

SHRI JAGESH DESAI: I am not on that point. This is the idea which I have mooted.

PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR (Bihar): I have a point of order Mr. Vice-Chairman. COPU is a body. Is this House authorised to pass a sweeping judgement on the competence or lack of a body like the Committee on Public Undertakings? It may not have functioned the way a particular Member might have liked, not because the competence might not have been there but because the procedure on which it has been working... (*Interruptions*)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): He has raised a point of order.

PROF CHANDRESH P. THAKUR: It is well within the right of the COPU to call the services of the experts, to strengthen its professional capability. So, I will...

SHRI KAMAL MORARKA (Rajathan): Is it a subject where anybody can speak? I have got some views on COPU.

SHRI VIREN J. SHAH (Maharashtra): I have been a member in late 60s and 70s.

PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR: I am raising a point of order whether this House is authorised to make that kind of a judgement.

SHRI KAMAL MORARKA: Yes, It is.

PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR: No, it should not. (*Interruptions*).

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): There is no point of order.

PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR: Kamal, don't give the judgement. Let the give the judgement on my point of order.

SHRI KAMAL MORARKA: We do not want judgement. Let him speak.

PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR: Is the House authorised...

SHRI KAMAL MORARKA: The discussion on international situation is coming. These Congress party members take away all the time.

SHRI VIREN J. SHAH: This is a filibustering attempt.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: Sir, honourable Members are only giving their suggestions about the system. They are not going into each and every subject (*Interruptions*)...That is what I am saying.

PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR: My submission is, rather than passing that kind of a judgement, Members could consider bring reform or modification in the functioning of the COPU so that it can be more effective.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN: (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): There is no point of order... (*Interruptions*)... Please go ahead now, Mr. Desai. Don't yield.

SHRI JAGESH DESAI: Sir, from my own experience I am saying that COPU has done such a good work and I am confident that COPU can deal with this problem. They can call expert evidence from BIFR because Government officials are already there on the Board of

Directors and they are not speaking. I think, if COPU is there, all parties can put their mind together and find a solution, and if they feel that even by pumping large amounts it can't be revived, then it is a fit case for closure, and what can be done for closure can be decided by COPU.

Sir, regarding management, why has this happened? If you appoint an industrialist who has no commitment to the public sector, as you have done in the case of Indian Airlines and Air India, then this is going to happen. If there are CMDs who are committed to the public sector—and I have seen that they have given good results—it would improve. As such, when the new appointments are made, it should be technocrats and not IAS officers. We don't want them. They are good for administration and, as far as administrative matters are concerned, their help can be taken, but the CMD must be a person who is a technocrat and, for that purpose, I should again request the Ministry to see the report of the COPU regarding the accountability and autonomy in the public sector and, if the Government takes a decision on that basis, then I think we can improve the public sector.

No, regarding the pricing policy, yes, there can be a dual pricing policy. There can be one for the benefit of those persons who can't afford the prices and there can be a dual pricing policy for the public sector also. But, as regards administered prices, I am giving you one example of the steel industry. The inputs were going up, wages were going up and prices of raw materials were going up but, still, for three years you did not allow them to increase their prices.

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE (Maharashtra): Tatas were making profits.

SHRI JAGESH DESAI: I am giving the example... *(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): Desaiji, concentrate on your own speech.

SHRI JAGESH DESAI: If the prices of the inputs are going up, if the wage bills are going up, then they should be allowed to increase the prices, and a price revision should be allowed every six months. If prices are going up, increase should be allowed; if prices are coming down, decrease should also be allowed. If that kind of a system is not given, then you will again make the public sector sick.

Now, regarding the effect of the devaluation on the public sector, officially a 19 per cent devaluation was there on the 3rd of July. But, from 1st April to 3rd July, there was another 12 per cent fall in the value of the rupee. And, after that devaluation, till the end of November there was another fall of 11 per cent. Whatever you may say, that you were not devaluing it and so on, again there was a fall in the value of the rupee by a 11 per cent in the months of July, August, September, October and November. In these four, five months again there was a reduction and the value of the rupee had come down by 11 per cent. So the total burden is about 40 per cent and many of the public sector undertakings whose projects are in process would be affected by about 40 per cent as far as the import content of the projects is concerned. Secondly, a new scheme has now been announced by the Minister of Commerce regarding import only on the basis of export, and only those who export would be given a 30 per cent exim scrip. I am told about this. I will be happy if I am wrong. Earlier, when the public sector undertakings were established, some of the machinery and equipment were imported. On that line the projects have been established. They cannot import if now. It is for Indian consumption. Whenever they have to import machinery or equipment for modernisation, they cannot import it. They will have to export to earn foreign exchange for that or they will have to buy the exim scrips from the market. For the exim scrips the premium today is 22 per cent. It may go up. Do you want to kill the public sector? Earlier we were giving licences to the public sector to import it. Wherever you feel that import is necessary in the larger interests of the country,

[Shri Jagesh Desai]

for carrying out their functions for which they were established, they should be given permission under the OGL or a special licence. Otherwise, the whole thing will go sick.

Secondly, I tell you that the biggest help given to the public sector undertakings was by Mr. Rajiv Gandhi. When they had no resources, it was Mr. Rajiv Gandhi who allowed the public sector to issue bonds, and the interest on those bonds was made tax-free. So, are you going to go on those lines or not? Are you going to treat the public sector and the private sector on the same lines? Of course, so many people want it. We say that we want to have commanding heights. So, it is necessary the public sector should be treated separately from the private sector. I do not want to kill the private sector. But whatever help we were giving to the private sector at that time we should give now. What Indiraji has done and what Rajivji has done has to be continued.

About the open-market philosiphy, I am very sorry to say that in a country where supplies are very much restricted and demands are high if you talk in the name of market economy, that means you are burdening the poor people with more prices. It can work in a capitalist country, not in a socialist country. In our Constitution we have said that India is a socialist country. As such we have to see that the public sector has to be helped.

Now I tell you why. Because I saw it yesterday only regarding mutual funds. You have allowed mutual funds also in the private sector. The Finance Minister, in his Budget speech, has said, "Mutual funds in the public sector banks are doing excellently." Inspite of that, why do you want to allow mutual funds in the private sector?

Again, I read another statement that the mutual funds in the public sector and those in the private sector. they will treat equally. Is that the policy of the Government? If that is the policy of the Government, then, I think we are deviating from the policy of Pt. Jawaharlay Nehru, Indiraji and Rajiv Gandhi ji and Congress men will see that this kind of deviation cannot be allowed in our basic policy. (*Interruptions*) "If it is so," I say.

Then, Sir, I would like to talk about disinvestment. You have selected some industries for the purpose of disinvestment. But what are the guidelines on which you are deciding about it? I can understand if it is taken by the employees. I do not know what will happen to the mutual funds which have been allowed in the private industries. Are you going to allow them? At present it is "No." Probably all right, you have got funds. They can also be invested. Why do you want that kind of disinvestment when the profit is 20 per cent in industries? I am not able to understand that. I can understand it in some industries which have marginal profits. Business men are not going to be attracted to such industries. Personally I feel that this concept of disinvestment in public sector is a wrong philosophy because they will invest only where high profits are there, and nobody is going to invest where low profits are there. I think, for having Rs. 2,000 crores for the purpose of your budget, if you are going to have this kind to funds, I think, that is not a correct policy. We have invested about Rs. 98,000 crores and Rs. 2,000 crores is nothing against it. This shows somewhere somt policy modifications are being brought about. These modifications at least do not suit a person like me, who is having the old approach which Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru was having.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): Please conclude now.

SHRI JAGESH DESAI: I am concluding.

As regards the loss-making companies, I may point out that 9,815 are monopoly companies and 85 are other companies. In the case of 85 companies the investment by way of equity and loans amounts to Rs. 2,300 crores. There is a *halla-gulla* that the public sector is sick. They are

doing worst. But I must say that in the public sector the workers work for themselves and for the nation whereas in the private sector the worker works for himself and for his employer. That is why workers in the public sector should have the work culture. Otherwise persons like me, Gurudas Das Gupta and other would be responsible for closing down the public sector. We ourselves have to explain that to the workers.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: Mr. Desai, let me make it very clear that we want labour to be productive everywhere whether it is in the public sector or in private sector. You must have noticed that I have also criticised thte trade unions. I have said they cannot absolve themselves of the responsibility when there is a crisis. Mr. Desai, we have understood the cause of the crisis.

SHRI JAGESH DESAI: Please tell your trade unions they should not resort to strikes and bandhs. Please see that. We are all committed to the public sector. We want to see that the public sector should thrive. We want an efficiently run public sector. We do not want sickness there. Sickness in the public sector has to be completely avoided. One of the reasons of inefficiency in the public sector is the job security. I do feel a time has come when we have to say those who have job should not feel that they have a secure job. If they are not working and are incompetent, we have to treat them accordingly. Otherwise the public sector will go down the drain. Please don't allow that to happen. I am very confident that our present Prime Minister, who was with Pandit Ji, Indira Ji, Rajiv Ji, is committed to the public sector. He has said: We shall not leave the path chosen by Nehru Ji and Indira Ji. On the same path we shall go and we will see that commanding heights of the public sector are maintained.

SHRI PRAVAT KUMAR SAMANTARAY (Orissa): This is a deliberate attempt of this Government to dismantle a healthy building they had built themselves in a hurry to improve the economic health of the country. I do not know how this Government has reached a conclusion that they should dismantle the public sector, which they themselves built and nurtured for the last 30 years. Public sector concerns were encouraged as a result of the second Industrial Policy Resolution passed by the Parliament in 1956. The public sector was not only to earn profit for the State Exchequer, but it was also to bring about a balanced regional development and also to fulfil the social responsibilities of tht Government. Sir, it is surprising that this concept which has been introduced in this country, through this Parliament by the first Prime Minister of India, his very ideas have been dismantled by the Congress party very systematically. It is a deliberate attempt to erase the name of Nehru from the industrial revolution of this country.

At the moment there are about 23 lakhs of people working in the public sector undertakings. It has been rightly said by Mr. Gurudas Das Gupta that 75 per cent of the public sector undertakings are making profits. Is there any reason to create panic not only among the workers working in the public sector undertakings but among the management who are making efforts to come up with a better performance? I do not find any reason for this.

Since the passing of the second Industrial Policy Resolution, the industrial community in this country are very much critical against the Government's attempts to get more sectors in this country under public sector. This Government is obliging certain industrialists and certain individuals. That is why they have come up with this idea. The money invested, the manpower and expertise which have been built up for the last so many years are to be surrendered to the people who are having a nexus with the public sector management or the people in the Government for the last so many years.

I would like to raise a question to this Government where have things gone wrong for the public sector management? What are the reasons to hand over the public sector units to BIFR? BIFR are having deputationists from those organisations where they have proved inefficient and corrupt. Instead of finding out the reasons where the public sector units are making

[Pravat Kumar Samantaruy]

losses, instead of trying to correct the errors committed through wrong policies of the management, they are making an attempt to sell out the public sector of this country to some individuals, at the instance of whom, I do not know. It is really a regretful action. We the people here are responsible for the crores of pople of this country: Are we really serious to come with an answer. Are we inefficient to hand over the management of this country to certain individuals who are coming under the coverage of the private industrialists Even assuming that private sector undertakings are making good profits, then why our public sector units are running in losses? It is simply because we have neglected the professionals, those who really matter in the management and technical knowhow of the public sector undertakings. It is just not a secretarial management only thinking that IAS officers can prove to be efficient. I do not make a s'atement that all IAS officers are inefficient to manage the public sector. But it is a fact to be reckoned with. Wherever there is loss, it is because of the proven inefficiency of the officers who have been put at the saddle of management of the public sector unit concerned. There is another reason too. Some of the public sector undertakings, where thousands of crores of rupees are invested, are going without the top management at all for years together. The appointment committee never sits to go for the appointments: When there is no head for an organisation, it is bound to make losses. You do not see all these things when you want to eradicate the ills of public-sector undertakings. You only chose to hand over the management or bring a Bill for the sick industrial undertakings. I know this is just like beating the drum into a deaf ear. I am not only apprehensive but I am sure that the Government will change whatever statement they make. The Finance Minister has done it. When he made a statement that they are not going to hand over public-sector undertakings, what are the reasons for bringing about the SickIndustries Amendment Bill? It proves that they have made up their mind. I demand the Govt. to create an atmosphere so that public can help in building themselves to manage the country but govt. goes with such individuals to whom they owe; I do not say in what manner. Thank you.

SHRI MURLIDHAR CHANDRAKANT BHANDARE: Mr. Vice-Chairman, there has been a great deal of talk about the wastage of public funds, public time. I think all this must begin at home. Therefore I had suggested that the discussion of this item which covers the field of the enactment of the Industrial Companies (Special Provisions) Act, 1985, should be done together with that. That suggestions was not accepted. I think we could have saved precious time and in the process, precious national money. I think care should be taken to see that we do not duplicate the debate, we do not duplicate the discussion and we have one discussion when the topics are common. When this is undoubtedly a very very important subject for discussion, I am happy to see that there are really no hostile and opposing views. I find that more or less there is a consensus and the consensus has to be there because I think, above everything, we stand by the oath of allegiance, which we have taken when we entered this august House, to the Constitution of India. And there can be no two opinions that the constitutional goal as envisaged by our Constitution is an egalitarian society with justice and equity in all spheres, social, economic and political. The individual is at the heart of the Constitution and the Constitution is enacted and proclaimed to ensure and guarantee to that individual a life with dignity. Such a life with dignity, of course, includes food, shelter clothing, medical care, education, employment, leisure, safe environment and full security. I think nothing is more degrading to a human being than being unemployed. Then he is deprived of all other rights also. And while we are on this subject, I may seem to be a little irrelevant, I may seem to be digressing a little But I think what is at the core of problem of unemployment or insufficient economic prosperity is the galloping population of our country. I think every occasion that we get to talk about this issue, which is eating very severely into our economic system, should be availed of to focus the attention to cause awareness among the public and see that the

growth of population really falls. We should have fewer to share the cake and then we will have the constitutional goal of egalitarian society early. Unfortunately today, what happens is that the cake becomes smaller and there are many many more shares for that.

The second thing which I want to say very emphatically is that we must improve our work culture. We are dreaming of becoming Japan, Germany, U.S.A. without their work culture. The time has come for us, particularly in this House to see that we do not bring the work in this House to a halt, as we do so often. I think the message should go to all and I am apealing to my friends on the other side that there should be no strikes at all. Instead of strikes, we should now work for double the time without even expecting overtime allowance because unless we produce more, unless we show dedication to our work, unless we show some kind of commitment to excellence of work, the quality will not improve, the quantity will not grow and we will remain where we are.

The third point which I want to make is, what has really happened is that in our country, the wages have not been linked up with productivity. I have had enough experience, appearing for the labour and being part of the trade union in my earlier life. Every time, when it came to giving wages, not even one person was prepared to link it up with productivity. There are many eminent industrialists in this House. None of them did it. In the cotton textile mills when the wage was 30 rupees per month they made an ad hoc increase of Rs. 5/- bringing it to Rs. 35/-. It is really unfortunate that when the Government could have done it in the public sector, it also did not do it. Therefore, what is relevant is that we should link up our wages with productivity. "Produce more and earn more", that should be the motto.

Now I want to go back to the time of our independence. Strictly speaking, they say: "What have you to do?" I am not here to apportion the blame either to the private sector or to the public sector. But past is relevant for the present and present is relevant for the further, I still remember, at that time, we had only two options. No private or public, Indian company, could have contributed to the industrial growth of this country as we see it today. There were only two options open one was to take it in the public sector and that is why today we have a complete infrastructure, whether it is power—Bhakra Nangal Dam—whether it is oil, whether it is steel, whether it is any other infrastructural activity, you find that the large capital-intensive units could be put up the public sector. There was, of course, a second option. At that time, the private industry in India was not in a position to take up the challenge at all and even today you will find that it is not in that position. I will give you one illustration. The second option was to hand it over of the multi-nationals. (*Interruptions*). At that time, you would not have been here to say, "hear, hear". I still remember while apeading for the workment of Leve Brothers, how on an invested capital of one crore of rupees, every year, they were making 2 crore of rupees and siphoning off that money out of India.

SHRI KAMAL MORARKA: Still making?

SHRI MURLIDHAR CHANDRAKANT BHANDARE: Yes, still making. That is correct, but nothing is coming out for the benefit of the country; let me make it very clear... (*Interruptions*)...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): Let him complete his points. Don't provoke him.

SHRI MURLIDHAR CHANDRAKANT BHANDARE: If he wants to defend himself, he has to see himself in the mirror... (*interruptions*)...

SHRI KAMAL MORARKA: I am not a multinational. I am not a millionaire. I am Kamal Morarka ... (*interruptions*)..

SHRI MURLIDHAR CHANDRAKANT BHANDARE: You are Gamine

[Shri Murlidhar Chandrakant Bhandare]

Dunkerly. You can deny that... (*Interruptions*)...Of course, I have said you are Gannon Dunkerley.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): Please complete it.

SHRI KAMAL MORARKA: Sir, the debate is on a personal level. He is making ... (*interruption*)...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): Please sit down... (*interruption*)...

SHRI MURLIDHAR CHANDRAKANT BHANDARE: You started interrupting from there, leaving your stat and ... (*interruption*)...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): Mr. Bhandare, you restrict yourself to your own subject.

SHRI MURLIDHAR CHANDRAKANT BHANDARE: Sir, I am coming to the most important aspect. We have to see what we did at that time. The correct thing to do now is to build all that vision of Jawaharlal Nehruji of having a public sector with commandisg heights. What is really mising is our real thrust... (*interruption*)... Sir, may I request you to control the Member because I am disturbed again and again?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): Once you start speaking, he will be controlled. Your speech will control him. You make your points.

SHRI MURLIDHAR CHANDRAKANT BHANDARE: Sir, my thoughts are getting disturbed.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): I can assure you that the Chair is listening to you, not to him.
... (*interruption*)...

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: His links are missing Sir.

SHRI KAMAL MORARKA: Sir, I am also listening to him, but I am unable to understand him.

(Interruptions) N

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): No, no; the debate is not on missing things.

SHRI MURLIDHAR CHANDRAKANT BHANDARE: Sir, I assure you I can't attempt to really educate Mr. Kamal Morarka.
... (*interruption*)...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): He has walked out. Now he has walked out, you can continue.

SHRI MURLIDHAR CHANDAKANT BHANDARE: Let us go back seriously to the subject. What is really missing is our thrust on the rural industry and that is what I had said when we had a discussion on the Industrial Policy. Today, the need of the our is that we must offer relief to a much expanded employment programme located in a rural area to draw the unemployed away from a stressful high-cost urban environment. I think something must be done in regard to this increase in employment; otherwise the figures are staggering, I mean unemployment will grow, the miseries of the people will increase and with this I come to the most important aspect of today's discussion...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): Now you have to summarise your points.

SHRI MURLIDHAR CHANDRAKANT BHANDARE: Sir, I will take another five minutes. I come to the point, namely, that though past is relevant, we cannot deny that the public sector for one reason or the other has substantially performer well,... (*Interruption*)... I think this is the right opportune moment for us to look into what has gone wrong and how to set it right. The Supreme Court in the Bharat Oil Corporation's case held that a public sector undertaking is 'state' and it was subjected to the same restrictions which a state has—as a result of which great restraints were put on all the public sector units. If they have to compete, they have to compete with the

same degree of freedom which even the private corporations have. Therefore, the point is today we must make a determined effort to see that those public sector units which have become a drain on the society, which cannot be revived, which are not only sick but also beyond any recovery, are closed down. Otherwise, what we are doing is that we are pumping good money into those units. I will give you one example. I was one who was very responsible to nationalise Hind Cycle. I came along with a delegation from Bombay to Delhi when the Hind Cycle was clossed down and then it was nationalised. All the workers agreed to take wages at 75 per cent of their wages. The result was that when the Government gave money for the wages, there was no money for the raw materials there was no money to pay the interest; and today if you go to the Hind Cycle you will find half the time the workers are doing nothing because either there are no raw materials or something else. I personally feel such thing should not be permitted at all. (*Interruptions*)... About the private management I can only tell that 25 per cent of the investment in the public sector is on the takeove- of the sick textile units and all those are rendered sick by the private owners without modernising on time, expanding them on time and siphoining off the money away. But, I am not going into those things. (*Interruptions*) . . .

SHRI KAMAL MORARKA: Please go into those things. Why are you not going on? Whom are you giving concession? Please go on.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): Please conclude.

SHRI MURLIDHAR CHANDRAKANT BHANDARE: Let me end up. (*Interruptions*) . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): Please conclude. (*Interruptions*) . . .

SHRI MURLIDHAR CHANDAKANT BHANDARE: I am prepared to yield. (*Interruptions*) . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): Mr. Bhandare, I will take it that you have closed your speech. If you do not resume your speech I have no other option. (*Interruptions*) . . .

SHRI MURLIDHAR CHANDRAKANT BHANDARE: No, I don't want. (*Interruptions*)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): That is all right. It is your sweet pleaseure to do what you like.

SHRI MURLIDHAR CHANDRAKANT BHANDARE: I don't want to go further. I have all the facts about the mismanagement of this type. I can put it before the House when the time comes. Therefore this is what I want to convey to The Government and what I want the Government to assure to us: (1) That the public sector will continue healthily. It will continue as a means of a very, very productive sector that brings profits and not sickness or becomes a drain on the society. (2) There will be no policy of hire and fire. (3) Unemployment is a punishment which we cannot allow in this cuntry. We are not in America where without doing anything a person can get 200 dollars per week. Once a person lose his employment he loses his bread and he leads a life of deprivation and depredation. Closure and unemployment should, therefore, be the last resort after every other thing has failed or every reasonable effort at revival has failed. (4) That you run the public sector efficiently so that at least the objectives of Jawaharlal Nehruji, Indiraji and Rajivji for achieving the commanding heights are realised. (5) Please remove all bureaucratic controls and put the management more and more in the hands of professional managers and if you have to think about the golden-hadshake it should not be without a provision for an alternative employment.

Changes are taking place all over the world, even in China. We did not choose a Russian model of economy. We did not chose a Chinese model either. We

[Shri Murlidhar Chandrakant Bhandare]

chose our own model of a mixed economy. Let that model continue, but we cannot be immune to the global changes and the liberalisation which is peryading all over the world. Let us also have a very close introspection and see how best we can improve so that we also take our place among the advanced nations in the world. Thank you.

4.00 P.M.

SHRI SUNIL BASU RAY: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, the subject that we are discussing is a very important subject. The question of public sector enterprises has come into sharp focus by the 29th Nofember general strike by the united working class of India. The strike has also highlighted the effects of the new industrial policy and the new economic policies announced by the Government. It is amazing to note that 15 per cent of the public sector units that are reported to be sick cannot be revived. Now, this statement is just opposite to the experience that we had. I can say with confidence that these units, that these industries can be revised and made to function efficiently if the persons who are responsible for these industries are serious enough. If the people responsible to guide these industries are serious, anything can be done. We have a total of 244 units with an investment of Rs. 99,315 crores and employing about 23 lakh people. Now if we just let the sick units close down, as the Government says, then 8 to 9 lakh workers would lose their jobs and about 15 per cent of the capital will be wasted. We cannot allow our national asset to be wasted like that. Some of the units which are today sick units had been taken over from the private sector. Thirty-two units were taken over from the private sector. IISCO coal industries and such other industries, these were taken over from the private sector. I still remember, before nationalisation of coal industries, the then management of the coal industry, that is, the Indian Mining Association, the Indian Mining Federation and the Indian Colliery Owners Association and others jointly came out with a one-page advertisement in the *Statesmen* that they would spend Rs. 80 crores or Rs. 79 crores something for modernising the coal mines. Thereafter the coal mines were nationalised. What is the total expenditure that we have incurred so far? Without that expenditure it would not have been possible to achieve the production that we have achieved so far. There is efficiency and there is inefficiency. But nationalisation has helped the coal sector, the power sector. So it is imperative that we make our public sector more efficient and the workers should be involved in the process. This is the message of the 29th November trike. The new Government which is thinking in terms of reorganising the economy should take note of the national mind in this respect. I painfully note that our country is being forced to witness the most tragic events that had aken place and that will take place in future. The decision of the Government to per 50 industries to the BIFR is not a happy decision. It will prove to be counterproductive. I appeal to the Government that they should revise their decision and take a decision which will be conducive to development of the indsutries, to the development of the economy and to develop all our national interests. It is wonderful to find in the reply given in this House on 28th November, 1991 that these public sector enterprises connot be improved. So, they are to be sacrificed. That is the spirit of the reply given on 28th November, 1991 in this House. Moreover, the Government has decided not only to close down these indsutries but also to impose upon them certain other burdens. While the public sector is being castigated as loss maker and inefficient, the fact is that the PSEs have during the Fourth Plan period created a total asset of Rs. 77,470 crores. During the Fourth Plan to Seventh Plan they have contributed to Central Exchequer Rs. 1,30,105 crores. In the face of this, the Government's decision to send 50 public sector enterprises to BIFR hurts the interest of eastern India very particularly. And the West Bengal industrial scene will have to undergo a major sea-change because after the change there will be only desert and wasteland and onthing else. Out of these 50 industries, about 25 or 26 industrie

are in West Bengal. Of these, the IISCO was to be modernised. The IISCO union had signed an MOU with the Government and with the Management to modernise the industry. That agreement has not been implemented so far. And the IISCO is going to ruin. There is a serious controversy within the Government whether to take help of the Japanese contractors or to take help of the Dustur Company or to take help from elsewhere. The way Government is behaving, they will kill the industries. They will not help them to get up. They will not help them to be cured. Sir, I request the Government to change its policy. I also request the Government not to make such statements or behave in a way which will further demoralise the workers, further demoralise people. This morning, when I was coming to the House, I received a telephone call at my residence from Calcutta saying that the Cycle Corporation of India Ltd. is facing a serious financial crisis which may lead them virtually to close the corporation much before a decision comes from the Government because the banks have given certain directives to the corporation which are countre-productive. I said that I cannot say whether I can communicate this message to the Government. But since I have got this opportunity and the Minister is also here, I am communicating this situation to them. There are MAMC and Ophthalmic Glass Producing Unit. I do not want to repeat as my esteemed friend Shri Gurudas Das Gupta had talked about them. But about the Cycle Corporation of India, I once aagin want to emphasise.

I know when it was born and its funeral is peraps being arranged by the Government of India. It was closed down in 1971. There was some problem in this project area and so it was handed over to the Industrial Reconstruction Corporation of India which is a predecessor of BIFR. But nothing was done. A number of industrial surveys were made. The latest survey was made by the Tata Consultancy. The Government knew about it. But nothing was done to improve the situation. No plan assistance was provided by the Govrnmeent. Whatever plans were made, they were converted into non-plan. That is why, there was no production. But the management, taking advance from the dealers, tried to produce something and when the workers tried to put in their efforts, they found that before their efforts were exhausted, the raw materials got exhausted. It is not a fact that workers have no work culture. Without the workers' work culture, India would not have been built up as it is today. We must pay homage to our working class. We must pay homage to our toilers without whose toil or whose labour, there would not have been any progress or there would not have been any civilisation. Those who are sitting here must help our workers to develop a modern work culture for developing modern technology and modern machinery.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): Your time is over.

SHRI SUNIL BASU RAY: I generally do not speak. But on this issue...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): But your time is over.

SHRI SUNIL BASU RAY: This is the experience of CCIL. The same thing is happening in the National Bicycle Corporation Limited of Ghaziabad. What happened there? It merged with the Gwalior Rayons. Even after the merger, it could not make profit. Why? Because it was in the private sector. The Government nationalises them not to improve them or to rehabilitate them but only to protect the profits and protect the interests of the management of the private sector and the private capitalists. That is why, our industry is facing such a ruinous situation. We must take care of this and we must revise our policies. Then, about coal...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): Now, pleased conclude.

SHRI SUNIL BASU RAY: These are all related.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): You may

[Shri Bhaskar Annaji Masodkar]

forward it to the Government. But you cannot take the time of the House. You have a limited time. You know that we are running out of time.

SHRI SUNIL BASU RAY: We are running out of time and we are running out of economy also.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): That is true. SS, us concentrate on running out.

SHRI SUNIL BASU RAY: I had put a question to the Coal Minister and he replied that a number of Coal Mines have been closed down after nationalisation. But he could not tell the exact number. He said that information was being collected. This is the way our vital industries are being run. When the Minister says that the units have been closed down, he does not have the information about the number of such units. Is this not counter-productive? So, under these circumstances the memorandum officially sent to Mr. Camdessus, IMF, particularly its paras 26, 29 and 30 should be recast. The ideas in those paragraphs are the source of all the trouble that we are now facing and until and unless those ideologies, those formulations, are recast in consonance with tre interests of this country, I think the situation will not improve. Thank you.

श्री सुरेन्द्र जीत सिंह अहलुवालिया (बिहार) : उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, हम भारत की पब्लिक अंडरटेकिंग यूनिट्स की रुग्णता के बारे में चर्चा करने के लिए यहां उपस्थित हैं और पूर्ववक्ताओं के वक्तव्य सुन कर ऐसा महसूस हुआ कि हम लोग कहीं विभाजित हैं । किसी मुद्दे पर हम कहीं विभाजित हैं ।

हमारे देश में चाहें किसी की भी सरकार रही हो, नाममात्र के लिए तीन सरकारें जरूर आई कांग्रेस के सिवा, पर जब भी किसी की भी सरकार रही हो और उन्होंने अपने शासनकाल में जब भी बजट पेश किया हो, उस वक्त मौके के वित्त मंत्री ने कभी कोई संकेत नहीं किया कि पब्लिक सैक्टर को, चाहे वह रुग्ण है, चाहे वह कमजोर है, चाहे वह डूब रही है, उसको पैसा न दिया जाए ।

मेरे ख्याल में भारत के किसी नागरिक ने इस बात के लिए अंगुली नहीं उठाई कि एक पब्लिक सैक्टर यूनिट को चलाने के लिए अगर एक्सट्रा पैसा देने की जरूरत है, तो क्यों दिया जा रहा है, यह प्रश्न-चिन्ह आज तक नहीं लगा है । लोगों के मन में संशय हो सकता है । देख कर लोग समझते जरूर होंगे कि इस काम के साथ-साथ इतना विलासिता इतना भोग होने के साथ-साथ यह अगर संस्थान डूब रहे हैं, तो देश का इतनी मेहनत से कमाया हुआ पैसा क्यों बार-बार दिया जा रहा है ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, मुझे वह बात याद आती है जब नेहरू जी ने 1956 में इंडिस्ट्रियल पालिसी पर बोलते हुए कही । उस वक्त सब से बडी बात जो उनकी पूरी स्पीच में थी, जो मकसद था, और सारे के सारे भारतीय उससे सहमत होंगे, वह है आत्म-निर्भरता की, वह है सेल्फ-रिलाइन्स की—हमारा गोल, हमारा लक्ष्य, हमारा एम, हमारा आबजेक्ट आत्म-निर्भरता है । आत्म-निभरता का यह मतलब नहीं है कि हम अपने ही किसी और डिवेलपमैंट्स फंड से पैसा निकाल कर एक तरफ डालते जायें, और पब्लिक सैक्टर यूनिट इस तरह से लासेंस में रन करे, और उनको चलाने के लिए हम दिन प्रतिदिन डैफिसिट बजट के माध्यम से उन्हें पैसा देते रहें ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, 229 पब्लिक सैक्टर एंटरप्राइजेज हैं, जिनमें से सिर्फ 131 प्राफिट-मैकिंग हैं और 98 लासेंस में हैं । लासेंज के बारे में तो सबने कहा होगा, मैं जरा प्राफिट-मैकिंग इंडस्ट्रीज की तरफ आता हूं इंडियन आयल कारपोरेशन प्राफिट-मैकिंग कंपनी है, पर उसके साथ-साथ वह मानोपली आईटम है ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, नेहरू जी का कनसेंट किंतु यह नहीं था । नेहरू जी

ने जो सात मुद्दे उठाए थे, वह इस प्रकार से थे :—

—To promote self-reliance in strategic segments of the economy;

—To provide infrastructural facilities for promoting a balanced and diversified economic structure;

—To reduce concentration of ownership and prevent growth of monopolistic tendencies;

श्री जगेश देसाई : उन्होंने प्राफिट का भी जिक्र किया है ।

SHRI S. S. AHLUWALIA: To reduce concentration of ownedship and prevent growth of monopolistic tendencies;

—To reduce income and regional imbalances, to remove poverty and expand employment avenues;

—To expand the base of agriculture and industrial development and generate surpluses for reinvestment;

—To make the country self-reliant in modern technology and create professional, technological and managerial cadres; and

—To impose sound controls on trade and industry to ensure equitable distribution of goods and services."

महोदय, जहां तक इक्वीटेबल डिस्ट्रीब्यूशन आफ गुड्स की बात आती है और जहां तक मोनोपली की बात आती है, इंडियन आयल कारपोरेशन के पास चले जायें, इंडियन आयल कार्पोरेशन अपने प्लांट के लिए अगर कोई भी बाय-प्रोडक्ट तैयार करता है तो अपने प्लांट के लिए उसे हंडरेड परसेंट चाहिए और अगर वह किसी को कोटा देता है, किसी को अपने रा-मैटीरियल का एलोकेशन देता है तो वह 20 परसेंट । 20 परसेंट, 15 परसेंट अगर उसको देंखे, उसका ब्रेक ईवन प्वाइंट अगर देखा जाए तो उस यूनिट का ब्रेक ईवन प्वाइंट भी वहां नहीं पहुंचता है । उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, और तो और, आपने कभी गौर किया है कि कितनी भी पब्लिक अंडरटेकिंग हैं और जिनको हम मुनाफे की कंपनियों समझते हैं, आप स्टील इंडस्ट्री ले लीजिए, मुनाफे की अगर आप चिंता करें, स्टील इंडस्ट्री को लें, उसमें अगर देखें तो उसका प्राइम काम स्टील बनाना है, उसका काम कोलटार पिच बनाना नहीं है पर कोलतार पिच को बनाने के लिए पिछले डेढ साल में दो सौ प्रतिशत कोलतार पिच की कीमत बढाई गई है । उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, यह शायद प्राइस कंट्रोल के अन्दर नहीं हैं । इनकी प्राइस कंट्रोल की कमेटी जो है उसके अन्दर बाय-प्रोडक्ट की जो कीमतें बढाते हैं वह नहीं पढते । इसलिए मैन प्रोडेक्ट की प्राइस बढाने के लिए तो वह कमेटी के पास आते हैं ।

श्री चतुरानन मिश्र : उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, एक मिनिट अगर आप समय दें तो मैं कुछ कहूं । आपने चर्चा की स्टील इंडस्ट्री की और कोल की, मैं जर्मनी का उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, उदाहरण देता हूं । उनके यहां कोकिंग कोल का दाम कच्चा कोयले से कम है । वह कोक को ही सब्सिडाइज्ड कर देते हैं । आप लोग सब कोई अपने यहां की जितनी चीजें हैं उसको तो बहुत खराब समझते हैं, लेकिन दूसरे देशों का भी समझिए कि किस तरह चालाकी कर रहे हैं हमको-आपको सब को फंसाने के लिए । यहां जो मार्केट है हमारे यहां का वह 10—12 करोड लोग खुशहाल हैं, उसके लिए बहुराष्ट्रिक आए हैं । कोई दया की नीयत से नहीं आ रहा है । कोई आपकी मदद करने के लिए नहीं आ रहा है ।

श्री सुरेन्द्रजीत सिंह अहलूवालिया : उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, यह प्रोफिट अर्निंग कंपनियां किस तरह से प्राफिट अर्न कर रही है, किस तरह से इनकी बैलेंस सीट क्लीन हो रही है और वहां रैड फिगर से ब्यू फिगर में पहुंचती है, उसको जरा एनेलाइज करने की जरूरत है । मैं आपके माध्यम से, मंत्री महोदय से गुजारिश करूंगा कि जितनी भी प्रोफिट अर्निंग कंपनीज हैं इनके पिछले 20 साल के इतिहास को स्कूटीनाइज करने की जरूरत है कि वह कैसे यह है और इसके बाय-प्रोडक्ट जो हैं, इसके जो साइड बाय

[श्री सुरेन्द्रजीत सिंह अहलुवालिया]

साइड और प्रोडक्ट निकलते हैं उनका दाम कितनी डिग्री बढ़ा है और कितना बढाया गया है और कैसे उसको बैलेंस शीट में मैनिपुलेट किया गया है, यह फिगर जगलरी है और उसका इफ़ेक्ट जो वह बाय-प्रोडक्ट खरीदता है उसकी कंपनी पर पड़ता है, इसके फिनिश प्रोडक्ट पर पडता है और उसके बाद वह मार्केट पर पड़ता है । और जब वह मार्केट में मंहगा सामान आता है घूम-फिर कर वही कंपनी वह सामान खरीदती है और वह मंहगा होता है उसका सामान तो यह एक नैगेटिव इकोनोमी का सर्कल चलता रहता है । इस सर्कल को रोकने की जरूरत है ।

महोदय, जो कंपनियां लासेज में हैं, उनके बारे में चर्चा करने से पहले हमें इस पर विचार करने की जरूरत है कि वाकई उन्होंने कोई ध्यान दिया है लोकेशनल एडवांटेज का, कई जगह देखा गया है पोलिटीकल डिसीज़न होते हैं कि कंपनी हमारे इलाके में लगानी है या हमारी कौन सी कंस्टीट्यूंसी में लगानी है । उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, वहां पर न तो रा-मैटीरियल है, न बिजली है और न वहां कोयला है, लेकिन वहां लगाने के लिए मंत्री महोदय ने कह दिया और कंपनी वहां लगाई गई । वह फीज़िबल नहीं रही, इकोनोमिकली वायबल नहीं रही, बंद हुई । यह तो लेकेशनल डिस्एडवांटेज के कारण बंद हुई । उप-सभाध्यक्ष महोदय, उसके साथ-साथ यह भी चर्चा करने की जरूरत है कि जब ऐसी विदेशी कंपनियां हम लाते हैं और विदेश से तकनीक लाते हैं, मुझे थोडा आश्चर्य हुआ, अपने कानों पर थोडी देर तक विश्वास नहीं हो रहा था ।

गुरुदास दास गुप्त जी जब कह रहे थे कि हमारे रसियन दोस्तों ने हमें जैक भेज दिया है, टैकनोलोजी के नाम पर जंक भेज दिया है तो आज इतने सालों बाद उनको यह एहसास हुआ है । उस वक्त तो लाल झंडा लेकर उनको लाल सलाम बजाते थे और अगर आज वह कष्ट में हैं तो ऐसा कहना उचित नहीं है । रसिया ने अगर जैक भेजा है तो उन्होंने जब दोस्ती जैक नहीं भेजा है, रसियन तकनीक लेने जो आदमी यहां से गया था, उसकी क्या एकाउंटेबिलिटी है ? क्या कभी कोई तकनीकी कारण की वजह से कोई यूनिट बंद होती है ? अगर आउट डेटेड तकनीक ले आता है तो क्या आज तक किसी अफ़सर को या किसी टैक्नीकल अफसर को आप लोगों ने प्रोसीक्यूट किया है कि यह गलत तकनीक ले आए । इसके लिए क्या कोई कमेटी बैठी है ?

श्री चतुरानन मिश्र : किस इंडस्ट्री में जैक आया ?

श्री सुरेन्द्रजीत सिंह अहलुवालिया : दास गुप्त जी कह रहे थे, भिलाई के बारे में ।

श्री चतुरानन मिश्र : मैंने सुना नहीं, इसलिए आपसे पूछा ।

श्री सुरेन्द्रजीत सिंह अहलुवालिया : भिलाई के बारे में कहकर गए हैं ।

श्री चतुरानन मिश्र : कहें कि कहां जंक आया है ?

श्री सुरेन्द्रजीत सिंह अहलुवालिया : भारत ऑप्थाल्मिक ग्लास के बारे में । यह दुर्गापुर की युनिट है । आउट डेटेड का मतलब और क्या है आप के लिए ? ...(व्यवधान)...

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री आस्कर अन्ताजी मासेदकर)—अहलुवालिया जी, कम्प्लीट करिए ।

श्री सुरेन्द्रजीत सिंह अहलुवालिया : आप उसको ऑब्सोलिट कह लीजिए, जैक कह लीजिए, आउट डेटेड कह लीजिए । तीनों बराबर ही हैं ।

तो आज तक कोई भी अफसर, टैक्नीकल अफसर प्रोसीक्यूट किया है ? कहने को लोग मजदूर पर आरोप लगा देते हैं । मेहनतकश मजदूर जो 8 घंटे काम करता है, उसका क्या कुसूर है ? पर हां, कुछ-न-कुछ राजनीतिक दल इसका नाजायज फायदा उठाते रहते हैं, जैसाकि

जगेश देसाई जी ने कहा कि एक बार बंद करने से कितना लॉस होता है, इस पर कभी ध्यान दिया है या इस पर कभी सोचा है ? उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, अभी हमारे मार्क्सवादी बंधु भी बोल रहे थे और मिश्र जी भी बार-बार कह रहे हैं... (व्यवधान) मैं आपको इतना बताना चाहता हूं कि वे जो 98 लॉस मेकिंग इंडस्ट्रीज हैं, इनमें सिर्फ एक राज्य में 41 हैं । सिर्फ एक राज्य में, और वह एक राज्य है, सर्वोपरि राज्य वेस्ट बंगाल, पश्चिम बंगाल जिसका नाम है । उसे पश्चिम बंगाल राज्य में 41 में से 23 इंडस्ट्रीज लॉस मेकिंग हैं बुरी तरह और उन 23 में से 22 जो हैं, वह सिक हो गयी हैं, लॉस मेकिंग से भी नीचे चली गयी हैं ।... (व्यवधान) ... और उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, इसका कारण क्या है ? कारण तो वहां एक सीधा-सा नारा है जिसे कि बंगाल का बच्चा-बच्चा जानता है—आखिरे आशा जाबार जोबनी माहने पाई व्याज कोरार जोन्नो ओवर टाइम चाई दफ्तर में आने-जाने के लिए हमें महीना मिलता है और काम करने के लिए हमें ओवर टाइम चाहिए ।

SHRI ASHIS SEN (West Bengal): This is only to condemn the working class. (*Interruptions*)...

SHRI S. S. AHLUWALIA: I am not condemning the labour class. I am condemning the leaders, trade union leaders. I am telling about them (*Interruptions*).

ये राजनीतिक नेताओं के भाषण हैं, मेरे नहीं हैं । मैं लेबर क्लास को बुरा नहीं कह रहा हूं ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री भास्कर अन्नाजी मासोदकर) : अहलुवालिया जी, कृपया समाप्त कीजिए ।

श्री सुरेन्द्रजीत सिंह अहलुवालिया : उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, यह तो नारा चलता है और कभी यह सोचने की जरूरत पड़ी है, क्या कभी दिमाग लगाकर इस चीज को सोचा गया है कि इन यूनिटस को बंद करने के पीछे कारण क्या है ? उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं बहुत सारे कारण आपको बता सकता हूं पब्लिक सेक्टर अण्डरटेकिंग्स में ऐसे ट्रेड युनियन लीडर्स हैं जोकि प्रोफेशनल हैं । उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, ट्रेड यूनियन माफिया भी चला है जिनका काम सिर्फ यह है कि अगर आपकी यूनिट कम्पीटीटिव यूनिट है, तो प्रायवेट सेक्टर में जो आपके कम्पीटीटर हैं, उनके इंटरेस्ट में ये लोग पब्लिक सेक्टर को बंद करवाते हैं । उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, ऐसे एक यूनिट नहीं, बहुत सारे यूनिट हैं । ... (व्यवधान)...

SHRI ASHIS SEN: Is mafia not there all over the country, including your area ?

SHRI S. S. AHLUWALIA: I am born and brought up in Bengal.

SHRI ASHIS SEN: No question of Bengal... (*Interruptions*).

SHRI S. S. AHLUWALIA: They all belong to my birthplace.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): You conclude now.

श्री सुरेन्द्रजीत सिंह अहलुवालिया : उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, कंपनियां बंद करने के पीछे हमारे कुछ कारण होते हैं, उन कारणों पर गौर करने की जरूरत है । यहां हर आदमी कहता है कि मजदूर के साथ ज्यादती हो गई है, मजदूरों के हित में अहलुवालिया नहीं बोल रहे हैं । लेकिन, मैं एक ऐसे संप्रदाय से आता हूं, जहां पंगत पर विश्वास किया जाता है । अगर आप वह जापानी कल्चर भारत में चालू कर दें, जिसमें मैनेजिंग डायरेक्टर से लेकर वर्कर्स तक बैठकर एक ही केण्टीन में खाना खाते हैं, अगर आप इसे भारत में चालू कर दें तो बहुत सुधार हो जाए । जो हमारे साधु-संतों ने भी सिखलाया कि इस तरह समाज को तनावग्रस्त न होने देने या तनावग्रस्तता से बचाया जा सकता है । वैसे ही कल-कारखानों के अंदर के वातावरण को तनाव से दूर रखने का सही तरीका यही है कि वहां की मैनेजमैंट और वहां के मजदूर एक डायनिंग टेबल पर बैठकर खाना खायें, एक कैण्टीन में बैठकर खाना खायें । पर, हम एक ही केण्टीन में बैठकर नहीं खिला सकेंगे

[श्री सुरेन्द्रजीत सिंह अहलुवालिया]

क्योंकि वहां ऐसे लोग उपस्थित हैं, जिनको वर्कर्स से कोई मतलब नहीं है ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, हम इन यूनिटस के रोग को रोकने के लिए नोन वर्किंग ट्रेड-यूनियन के लीडरों पर रोक लगाने का कोई कानून पास करेंगे क्या जो वर्किंग क्लास में नहीं है और बाहर से आकर ट्रेड-यूनियन चलाते हैं, जिनका पेशा ही ट्रेड यूनियन के माध्यम से पैसा कमाना है, उसको देखना होगा ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, हमारे यहां जो वेस्टेज हैं, इंडस्ट्रियल वेस्टज... (**व्यवधान**)...

SHRIMATI KAMLA SINHA (Bihar): Sir, he is going beyond the limit of the discussion.

SHRI S. S. AHLUWALIA: You do not know the boundaries of the discussion. That is the problem.

SHRIMATI KAMLA SINHA: I know very well. That is why. I am saying it.

SHRI RAM AWADHESH SINGH (Bihar): She knows better than you.

जब आप पोलिटिक्स में पैदा नहीं हुए थे, तब से वह पोलिटिक्स में हैं... (**व्यवधान**)...

श्री सुरेन्द्रजीत सिंह अहलुवालिया : यह मेरा दुर्भाग्य है कि उनके साथ पैदा नहीं हुआ मैं ।

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह : नहीं, जबसे आप पैदा नहीं हुए थे, तब से... (**व्यवधान**)...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): Let us not go into personal matters.

श्री सुरेन्द्रजीत सिंह अहलुवालिया : उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, जो इंडस्ट्रीज वेस्टेज हैं, मैं एक साधारण सी बात बोलता हूं कि एक दिन मैं मारूति कारखाने में गया, जब नया-नया मारूति कारखाना शुरु हुआ था तो एक जापानी वर्कर को मैंने देखा कि वह फ्लोर पर जा रहा था, पर हर दस कदम के बाद झुक जाता था और झुककर उसमें से कुछ उठाता था, फिर जेब में डाल लेता था । मैं बहुत देर तक उसका तमाशा देखता रहा । बड़ी देर देखने के बाद मैंने उसे रोका और पूछा— बार-बार तुम क्या उठाते हो और जेब में डालते हो ? क्या धूल उठाते हो भारतमाता की ? क्या करते हो ? उसने जेब से करीब दो सौ स्क्रू निकालकर दिखाए, जो कि फ्लोर पर गिरे हुए थे। वह उन्हें उठा-उठाकर जेब में डाल लेता था और फिर ले जाकर टूल-बॉक्स में डाल देता था । तो यह एक छोटा सा संचय है, जो राष्ट्र को बचा सकता है । हम गर्व से तो कहते हैं बहुत कुछ, कि एक मजदूर देश के लिए काम करता है और अपने लिए काम करता है, चाहे प्राइवेट काम करता है या पब्लिक में काम करता है ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, क्या इसके लिए कोई हमारे यहां ट्रेनिंग ऐसी लेबर्स को होगी ? अगर ट्रेड यूनियन्स के लीडर्स ही अपने मेम्बर्स को समझाएं कि हम कुछ संचय कर सकते हैं तो वह बहुत कुछ संचय हो सकता है ? पर उस रास्ते पर नहीं है । एकाउण्टेबिलिटी बोलकर कोई चीज नहीं है ।... (**व्यवधान**)...

श्री अरविन्द गणेश कुलकर्णी : मेंम्बर को कौन समझाए यह, भाई ? ... (**व्यवधान**)...

श्रीमती कमला सिन्हा : उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, एक बात हम आपकी अनुमति से कहना चाहेंगे और वह भी जानकारी के लिए, उससे अहलुवालिया जी को फायदा होगा । आज देश भर में जितने ट्रेड यूनियन सेंटर हैं, उसमें आई०एन०टी० यू०सी० ने 50 लाख मेम्बरशिप क्लेम किया है ।... (**व्यवधान**)...

एक माननीय सदस्य : बोगस है ! ... (**व्यवधान**)...

SHRIMATI KAMLA SINHA: I do not know whether it is bogus or not. I am not saying it. But the INTUC has claimed itself to be the largest trade union centre.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): Let him complete.

श्री सुरेन्द्रजीत सिंह अहलुवालिया : महोदया, शायद आपने हेडफोन नहीं लगाया । हेडफोन लगा लें । मैंने कहीं सीटू नाम नहीं लिया । मैंने किसी परटिकुलर पॉलिटिकल पार्टी की ट्रेड यूनियन का नाम नहीं लिया है, आप जरा हैड-फोन लगाकर सुनें ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, जर्मनी में, फ्रांस में, इटली में, वहां भी हड़तालें होती हैं पर हड़ताल के दिन वहां का वर्कर अपने कारखाने जाता है और मशीन की मेन्टेनेंस करता है । लेकिन यहां तो राज्य सरकारें ताला भी दे देती हैं, चाबी भी दे देती हैं और फैक्टरी के बाहर गेट पर ताला लगा दिया जाता है । पुलिस खड़ी करके वहां ताला लगा दिया जाता है और कहा जाता है कि कोई वर्कर आएगा तो उसे उठाकर बंद कर देंगे । और तो और पिछले दिनों देखा गया कि बंगाल के गृह सचिव ने नोटिस दे दिया, सरक्यूलर दिया 29 नवम्बर को और पूरे का पूरा बंगाल बंद करा दिया ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं अंत में आता हूं कि चाहे जो भी है, इसका फैसला लेने से पहले, इस पर विचार करने से पहले हमें सबसे बड़ी चीज़ का जो डिसीज़न लेना है, पहला, कि किसी भी इंडस्ट्री को, चाहे किसी भी पब्लिक सैक्टर में हो या प्राइवेट सैक्टर में, मोनोपली आइटम नहीं देना है क्योंकि मोनोपली आइटम लेकर उसका दिमाग खराब हो जाता है । अगर उसके मोनोपली आइटम में भी कम्पीटीशन डाल दीजिए तो सुधार आ जाएगा और इन सारी कम्पनियों के बारे में निर्णय लेने से पहले, उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरी आपकी तरफ से सरकार से मांग है कि इन यूनिट्स को, जो कि इंडस्ट्रीज में हैं, इनको कैसे रिवाइव किया जा सकता है, इसके बारे में सोचा जाए । इनको मोडर्नाइज़ किया जा सकता है या नहीं किया जा सकता है, इनको डाइवरसीफाई करके सुधार किया जा सकता है या नहीं किया सकता, इसके बारे में सोचा जाए लेकिन मैं छंटनी के टोटली खिलाफ हूं । उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं इसलिए इसके खिलाफ हूं क्योंकि हमारे देश में पहले ही बेकारी बहुत है, बेकारों की संख्या आप और मत बढ़ाइए । इसको किस तरह से रिवाइव करने के लिए मोडर्नाइज़ करने की जरूरत है या डाइवरसीफाई करने की जरूरत है, उसपर गंभीरता से विचार किया जाए ।

अंत में मैं एक-दो सब्मिशन करता हूं कि हिन्दुस्तान फर्टिलाइजर्स कारपोरेशन इसकी हल्दिया यूनिट, दुर्गापुर यूनिट और बेरौनी यूनिट, इन तीनों को रिवाइव करने के लिए एक कमेटी गठित हुई थी और 108 करोड़ रुपये का उन्होंने बजट दिया था 1988 में और यह निर्णय नहीं ले सकते हैं इसलिए वह और बढ़ता जा रहा है, प्राइस एस्केलेशन हो रहा है । इसके साथ ही साथ क्योंकि मेरा जन्म आसनसोल में हुआ है, आसनसोल की साइकिल फैक्टरी के बारे में वे कह रहे थे । मैं उनको बताना चाहता हूं कि 1971 की बात उन्होंने कही, पर वह कारखाना 1971 में बंद हुआ था । पी०एम० के संत्रास के कारण और सी० पी०एम० के० लेबर अनरेस्ट के कारण, कांग्रेस का राज था और वह जो "सेनरिल" कम्पनी थी, वह बंद की गई थी वह आज तक बंद है । साइकिल कारपोरेशन ने उसको टैक-ओवर भी किया है, उसको चलाने की कोशिश भी चल रही हैं, पर अभी भी जो बंगाल सरकार द्वारा नियुक्त आफिसर वहां बैठे हैं, वे उसको चलने नहीं देना चाहते मैं आप के माध्यम से सरकार को कहना चाहता हूं कि इसमें इंटरवीन करके उस यूनिट को भी बचाया जाए । धन्यवाद ।

SHRI VIREN J. SHAH: Mr. Vice-Chairman, the discussion as listed here in the papers is 'Reported move of the Government to close down a number of Public Sector Undertakings... 'etc. I don't know where it is reported. But I think it might have been based on these two publications that have been circulated by the Department of Public Enterprises 3 or 4 days back—these monographs, though there is no date when it was printed. I have been looking at the four different volumes of the report of the Bureau of Public Enterprises that have been year after year placed before both Houses. I remember three years back trying to go through and get certain data out of it but it was an extremely difficult task. But having received them now ourselves, I find that these two monographs are very well-presented, well-documented, and it gives an eye-opening data the way in which it has been presented giving analytical facts and solutions. I do not know how many would have read these documents. Perhaps, if these documents had also included other industries, like the Heavy Engineering Corporation, which could run into difficulties, it would have helped.

Now, we must look at one or two matters here. Take, for instance, the question of social obligation. Social obligation of each company is mentioned high, medium, low, and that kind of rating. One does not know what yardsticks have been applied for this. One would like to be enlightened. For example, in the case of an undertaking like the International Airports Authority of India, it is said 'high in social obligation'. Now, what kind of social obligation the International Airports Authority of India is discharging to merit this grading 'high'?

But leaving that aside, I think, what is required is a dispassionate analysis, in the larger national interest. If we take as the touchstone what Mr. Ahluwalia quoted from Jawaharlal Nehru, from the Industrial Policy Resolution, if we take as the touchstone what Mr. Bhandare has said, about the Constitutional obligation, about the Directive Principles of State Policy, about equality, employment, etc., have we, today, created a situation in which some of these public sector undertakings have fulfilled the desires of Jawaharlal Nehru, or, met the obligations contained in the Directive Principles of State Policy, which Mr. Bhandare was talking about? In fact, there are too many people quoting Jawaharlal Nehru. But if you look at a book of Nehru's quotations, in 1952, he said: Our thinking has to be dynamic; we are not a static-minded people'. He said: 'What may be relevant today may not be relevant tomorrow; we should have the courage to move'. Unfortunately, when we are talking about Nehruvian principles and of moving away from them, we do not think of how Jawaharlal Nehru thought at that time.

Let me mention a couple of points here. I happened to be in China towards the end of October, 1988. It was almost the beginning of November, 1988. A meeting was being held in the Great Hall of the People, for the first time, with one hundered Chinese enterprise managers. From the next day, i.e. from 1st November, 1988, the law of liquidation was to come into force. This law, which was passed a year back, made it obligatory on the State to liquidate those units which could not become viable. This law was to come into force the next morning.

We had a meeting with Comrade Zhao Ziyang, the then Secretary-General of the Communist Party, the big boss. The then Secretary-General of the Communist Party of China mentioned this specifically. He said: 'We do not have the social security system which is there in the West, or, in Japan'. He said: 'We will have to find some solution because we cannot allow a few thousand workers to become a burden on the one billion Chinese, people'. He said: 'This is the problem before us; we are clear about it'. I will not talk about the Soviet Union, or, about Eastern Europe. They were dictatorships of the proletariat. Incidentially, I was in Budapest last month. The Minister for Privatisation of Poland, the Minister for

Privatisation of Hungary, and the Prime Minister of Slovenia were there. The discussion was on the Marxist-Leninist thinking. I was defending socialism. But those leaders said—this should make us realistic—We are for the people as a whole, not for a small group.'

I think, we might want to know certain facts. Only 3.7 per cent of the Indian population is in the organised sector. Keep that in mind. Can this 3.7 per cent of the population become a burden on the remaining 96.3 per cent of the population? Can it become a burden, if we take as the touchstone what Mr. Ahluwalia said, about Jawaharlal Nehru, about the Industrial Policy Resolution of 1956? Of this 3.7 per cent, sixty per cent are with the Government. State Government employees, Central Government employees, public sector employees, etc. I think, if we have this picture before us, if we take into thousands of crores When we talk blem and the number of people involved, it must make us objective and enable us to look at it in a dispassionate manner. We talk about losses. The losses run into thousands of crores. When we talk about losses, we are talking about only the Central public undertakings. We are not talking about the State public undertakings. We are not talking about the State Electricity Boards. The investment of the people of India in all these together, is over Rs. 400,000 crores. Four lakh crores of rupees, the people's money, collected through indirect taxes through the burden that we have put on the poorest, are involved in that. The impact of this on the poor is that funds are not available for development purpose funds are not available for drinking water, for education, for primary health centres, for wasteland development, for economic upliftment of the people about whom all of us are concerned. Along with that, certainly we might look at the workmen that are going to be redundant by any reason. (*Interruptions*). But why is budgetary suport required by the Central and State Governments? In fact, I am not revealing a secret that the Chief Minister of West Bengal, Mr. Jyoti Basu, is concerned about the boudgetary support that he has to give to the West Bengal State enterprises and he wants to find solutions. And this is for all States. I mentioend here about the starvation deaths in Bihar. The Minister replied to me about the starvation deaths in Bihar because of the closing of mines, and the tribals dying. In Orissa, in Kalahandi I mentioned the other day about women selling their children. This is where we are concerned and not at small number of people who are getting pay and are unable to produce or are unwilling to produce. I have several examples, but I will not go into them. If this 400.000 crores of rupees invested had given a return of 15 per cent, we would have brought Rs. 60,000 crores to the Central and State Exchequers. As a marginal point, if there had been a 12 per cent return, the return would have been Rs. 48,000 crores and imagine the impact of that on the Central and State Government Exchequers, imagine the impact of this on the developmental activities.

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE (Maharashtra): Over how many years?

SHRI VIREN J. SHAH: The return every year on the investment of Rs. 400,000 crores enable us to move towards development in the real sense note that people today have to walk five miles to get drinking water. So, this is the magnitude.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): Mr. Shah, if you do not mind, one minute.

Hon. Members, the consensps that the Business Advisory Committee reached in the meeting is that we will continue with the present discussion and there won't be any separate discussion on the Sick Industrial Companies (Special Provisions) Amendment Bill, which will be passed without further discussion.

SHRI VIREN J. SHAH: Then you should give more minutes.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): The time schedule is four hours. You can discuss it till you go on and the reply to this will be given by the Prime Minister tomorrow.

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: What time?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): The time will be fixed but this is the consensus arrived at. So, you can cover your points.

AN HON. MEMBER: What about the discussion on international situation?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): It will be postponed.

SHRI VIREN J. SHAH: Mr. Vice-Chairman, I was mentioning about the magnitude and dimension of the funds that we have invested and its impact on the national life, and the right kind of returns which everybody wants to be there. Had these returns been there, it would have made a difference to the kind of developing India, the India which Gandhiji and Jawaharlal Nehru dreamt of at that time.

So, we must be clear about our concern, our concern is for what and for whom. If we look in our hearts, I am sure, our concern is for these very poor peoplt of Kalahandi or the starving tribals of Bihar or our people in India where you are not getting one square meal a day or drinking water or educational or medical facilities, and not for those... I know of a public sector organisation in Bombay where a man works every day on a night shift only for ten minutes and gets full pay. Next Next- day he works somewhere else. So, the burden is on the people of India. In reply to a question last week in Rajya Sabha the Department of Heavy Industries gave the losses of 27 enterprises incurred during the last six months ending September and the amount was Rs. 285 crores. I do not know whether it covers full interest charges, depreciation and everything. But whatever may be the accounting system the same enterprises, last year, the same six months, made a loss of Rs. 286 crores. In reply to a question, the Minister for Fertilizers mentioned in this very House...

SHRI JAGESH DESAI: Earlier year, was it loss or profit?

SHRI VIREN J. SHAH: In this very House, in reply to a question, the Minister of Fertilizers mentioned about Rs. 2,000 crores of accumulated losses of Hindustan Fertilizer Corporation and the Fertilizer Corporation of India. I do not think they were taken-over companies from the private sector. Let us look at the facts. When Mr Jagesh Desai talked that based on the capital investtd the income was so much, I think we must disaggregate take out, the oil sector.

SHRI JAGESH DESAI: Even then 50 per cent profit is there. Rs. 2,900 crores is in the oil sector.

SHRI VIREN J. SHAH: I am coming to that.

SHRI JAGESH DESAI: Even then Rs. 3,444 crores profit is there.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): You please go in your own way.

SHRI VIREN J. SHAH: If you look at this, there are a large number of companies which have wiped out their capital 10 times, 15 times, and there is one which has done it 130 times. One hundred and thirty times the capital is wiped out. These are realities. Can one say these are not facts Mr. Jagesh Desai can dispute the factual part.

SHRI JAGESH DESAI: My point is, only Rs. 2,300 crores....

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): Please allow him... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI JAGESH DESAI: Then let him give the correct picture. When he quotes me, I must say. In these 81 loss-making companies, the total invested by loan and liquidity is only Rs. 2,300 crores.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): Mr. Desai, the Minister is there to take care of all these things. He is competent to take care of them.

SHRI VIREN J. SHAH: Now, even in fertilizers also there is an accumulated loss of Rs. 2,000 crores by two Corporations. But in the public sector, the Central Government-owned National Fertilizers Limited is making profits. KRIBHCO and IFFCO in the cooperative sector are rated among the highest in the world. By world standards, in the cooperative sector, in fertilizers, they are doing very well. So there must be something basically wrong. I am not against the public sector *per se* certainly not.... (*Interruptions*). I am one of those who believe that it has a role to play, but the role must be like the National Fertilizer Corporation, KRIBHCO or IFFCO and not like Hindustan Fertilizer Corporation or the Fertilizer Corporation of India.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: He wants the public sector to play the role of Reliance and Bombay Dyeing. That is the trouble with him. We are listening to the voice of the private sector.

SHRI VIREN J. SHAH: Sir, I strongly object to Mr. Das Gupta's remarks. I am no less patriotic or concerned about it. ... (*Interruptions*)... Let us leave it, leave it.

Here, even monopoly units have been shown to make losses. I think a very good analysis was made by Mr. Ahluwalia about Indian Oil. But there are several monopoly units which are making losses. Why should it be so? Competitively they are losing much more, and that a continuous drought or burden on the Central and State bodies is responsible, and each State Government is finding itself in grave difficulties in meeting its basic requirements, including West Bengal Now, if you take West Bengal, the Bakreswar plant cannot come up because the State has no funds Electricity generation does not take place because the State has no funds. Pineapple in north Bengal cannot be developed because the State has no funds. And, because of that, there are high taxes and no industrialization takes place in West Bengal, similar situation is there in other States also.

Then, Sir, looking at the Central public sector enterprises—and this is my opinion —from the angle of their profits, other than the oil group, their performance is dismal. Even what is described as 131 profit-making public sector enterprises, 99 out of them gave a return of less than 12 per cent on the capital; 24 have given less than eight per cent—it is 24 plus 60. And 60 have given less than five per cent return—and they are shown as profit-making enterprises! Today, the cost of money is much higher than that. They cannot afford to pay the interest. And Government's borrowing rate is much higher than that. The accumulated losses of 98 public sector enterprises is Rs. 10,000 crores, if these documents are right—and I have no reason to disbelieve that. That

[The Vice-Chairman (Shrimati Jayanthi Natarajan) in the Chair]

is where when we talk about the social obligations, the social obligations include making profits, generating funds and giving them to the Central and State exchequers so that they can meet the needs of drinking water, public health, education and economic development of the poorest. I mentioned about the starvation deaths in Bihar. Our concern should be for that or for the Kalahandi situation that I have mentioned, that women have to sell, are selling their children today for Rs. 500. Today this is happening in this country after 45 years of independence because distribution of wealth has not taken place. Let us therefore look at it from the larger context, without having this peculiar thinking about 30-year old minds set we have got from which we are unable to move out, without Gurudas Das Gupta needing to say that I am talking on behalf of the private sector. That is out of question. So, let us also think about improving this.

The autonomy of the public sector is only in the name. In real terms, the

[Shri Viren J. Shah]

intereference from a Section Officer to a Minister is such that they are unable to function. I must tell you from my own experience of the last several years of meeting a large number of people in the public sector that man for man, they are better—I am making this statement—than one would find in the private sector. They are higher qualified, dedicated, working for long hours and want to contribute, but their hands are shackled. They cannot move. That must be the immediate concern of those of us who do not want these enterprises to get sick. The Finance Minister the day before yesterday made a commitment to the IMF and made a commitment to the people of India that there will be money coming in from public enterprises. The generation of resources will be from the public sector. But enable them to function.

One or two sentences for the BIFR that is not going to be discussed today, that the BIFR has been functioning for the last five, six years. Repeatedly the Chairman of the BIFR has written to the Government, Governments of 'A' party, 'B' party, 'C' party and again 'A' party to give legal status to the BIFR to make their recommendations implementable. Now the Government is thinking of it, only thinking of it. They have assured that they might bring suitable legislation. Unless we give the legal status to the BIFR, the result will be the same as it happened, in which case the private sector companies went to the BIFR and no solution could be found for no fault of the board. You will need larger number of members. You need a time-frame. The appellate authority also delays.

I would lastly again make only two comments Again I would not like to recall what comrade Zhao Ziang, the then Secretary General of the Communist Party said about China, about the total concept of people as a whole and not as a small sector who could be a burden on the rest of the country.

It would be now unfashionable to quote Mr. Gorbachev or the perestroika. My friends will raise objection. But there are some truths in whatever he said. He might, have failed for different reasons, for political oppressions of the last seventy years.

Hence, Madam, we need a dispassionate and objective approach from the national angle. Let us consider for the greatest good of the greatest numbers what we are going to do. If a burden is there, the dynamic thinking of Nehru we should have. Or, as Mr. Ahluwalia said, if there are certain institutes or organisations which are dead, then, let us not give them artificial oxygen, but with respect give them funeral, and provide resettlement retraining and other social benefits to those who are employed there, so that they can contribute to generation of wealth for the country. Thank you.

PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR: Thank you, Madam, for giving me this opportunity. This question of sick public enterprises in particular and the status of public enterprises in the Indian economy in general, are exercising our minds, both within the party and within the country. I would like to state very firmly that in a country like India the role of the public sector is vital and would remain so for a long time to come. There should be no doubt about it, there should be no second thought about it.

The public sector has made an immence contribution in the critical and strategic areas of the economy. Let it be reminded to those who are champions of the private sector and who are out to denigrate the public sector that much of whatever good is being claimed on behalf of the private sector, would not have been possible without the critical and qualitative support of the public sector, particularly through the infrastructure network, and the Government. The public sector has been from our point of view, a vehicle for a policy which we initiated right in the beginning. We decided to have a growth, but a regionally balanced growth. Let us face this reality. The private sector, no

5.00 P.M.

matter which business house we are talking about, it has a regional sector. Each business house has a regional concentration. I know of no private sector house which can claim that it contributes substantially and consciously in the process of growth in a regionally balanced way. It is here that within the limits of the techno-economic feasibility the locational policy of public enterprises has been consciously designed to promote regional balance. On that criterion a public sector is primarily a national sector, whereas a private sector is a regional sector. So, the choice is between a regional growth on the one hand and the national growth on the other. There is not much to choose between. We would like to use the vehicle of an efficient public sector promoting the national growth in a balanced way. To the extent the public sector has been doing that, we need to extend its presence and contribution and there should be no second thought in this regard.

On the other side, a large portfolio of the public sector has been a gift of the so-called efficient private sector. Take the case of the National Textile Corporation and the National Jute Corporation. Much of the wisdom and the managerial process of the private sector was busy engineering sickness. The companies have been drained off. The owners have pocketed all the goods that were left. In the ultimate analysis, in the interest of the society, in the interest of the workers, in the interest of the economy of the region, where the plants are located, the Government stepped in and took over the ownership of that. In the process, it has on its portfolio a set of enterprises which need perpetually large amount of subsidy at tax-payers' cost. So, let us face the issue. The choice today is not between public and private sector; the choice today is between an efficient sector and an inefficient sector. I can assure you the facts are known. There is nothing new that I am saying. Efficiency is not the monopoly of the private sector. In inefficiency there is more in terms of private sector contribution that this country has seen than what is there is in the public sector, because large part of the economy is still in the private sector. So, let us not confuse the issue. This is with regard to the managerial performance part. On that I will come a little later to add further points, but there has been an ideological debate also that is going on. We do realise when we started carving out our developmental strategy, we went through the process of what is called 'the mixed economy', the Nehruvian model, about which my friend, Mr. Jagesh Desai, talked and talked very feelingly. In the best wisdom of the country it was thought as a right thing to do. Look at the fate of countries. in Eastern Europe where there was no mixexd economy. It went through an entirely State sector. Today, when the State sector has not been able to steer the course of the economy to a point th it can even survive, then they have to turn around. The pandulum has changed from one end to the other. Whereas in our case, the very fact that we had a mixed economic framework, it gave us a lot o elbow space to change the proportion of the mixture. Today therefore the course correction within the large framework of the mixed economy or the ideological framework that we adopted to ourselves is not a departure from the Nehruvian model or the mixed economy model. It is a dynamic shift in the internal composition of the public and the private sector. In fact, it is not a move towards private sector. It is a move towards bringing competitive pressure on the working of the public sector, Monopoly helps sometimes initially to get a particular unit or industry off the ground. But perpetual monopoly has its unintended consequences whether it is in the public sector or in the private sector. I think we do realise that in the public sector the very fact that several of them enjoyed a monopoly presence has led to a complacency, perhaps an intolerable degree of complacency at the managerial level led to some of the things which could have been been avoided had there been a discreet competition imported on it.

Now we had 44 years of growth with what is called the public sector acquiring the commanding heights or a visible pre-

[Prof. Chandresh P. Thakur]

sence and a strong presence in the strategic sector. I think in the best wisdom of the policy-makers we thought that they have come of age and they can take on the pressures of competition whether they are domestic from the other public sector or domestic from the other private sector or in some cases even from the multinationals. May be if we go into final analysis perhaps there is scope for difference of opinion. Perhaps too much competition too soon in some vulneable areas is coming. There is scope for course correction. But the direction of the policies that move away from the monopoly to a competitive situation, allow market pressures to operate as an instrument to bring operating efficiency is welcome and it should be encouraged. It should not be misconstrued as an ideological shift. It should not be misconstrued as a time when the private sector should start clapping and patting their back saying, "they have failed and we are going to succeed." Ultimately when the public sector came the private enterprises had initially failed. I only hope that this strategic interventionist policy of the Government comes when you need and get withdrawn when you should. That is not the end of the game. If the course correction leads to unintended consequences, if the economy does not gain in the process, if the tax-payers still have to subsidise through soft loan to the private sector borrowers or the consumers have to pay the price through their noses or accept the inferior quality of the product that they produce or they enjoy the monopoly that they have been enjoying earlier, then, the Government will retain the option to intervene and intervene to the disadvantage of the private sector and more to the advantage of the public sector. So it is not a one-time change. It is a dynamic intervention. As the situation demands the Government policy will forge its instruments according to the exigencies of the situation.

The point I am trying to make is that the policy on public sector is not independent of the total macro-economic policy that we have chosen and particularly within the macro-policy, the industrial policy that we have chosen... (*time bell rings*) ..You are such a friendly person and still...

SHRI JAGDISH PRASAD MATHUR (Uttar Pradesh): Take due advantage of freindliness.

PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR: I am trying to take no undue advantage. I am simply saying that she is such a friendly person. ...(*Interruptions*)...I am saying she is such a friendly and charming person. Do you disagree with that?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN): He is doing it successfully.

PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR: The simple point I am making is that within the Industrial Policy we have decided to do away with the licensing. In the absence of a licensing policy there is a great risk in relatively unindustrialised region of the country the industries will not be located there. So I would like the Government to give a guarantee that whatever were the promises of a licensing policy in terms of delivering a locational balance, will not be allowed to suffer in a situation when there is no licensing policy. Through other instruments of the economic management, there will be a guarantee that almost every region of the country will get the opportunity for growth of income and employment in the industrial process. I think you can choose the package of infrastructure development, whether it relates to financial instruments or roads or power or other kinds of things. But it is important. Otherwise it will be very difficult to keep the country together. If the inequality of regional development gets further skewed, then the turmoil will multiply and we will have together to pay the price, a rather heavy price.

Madam, coming back to management part, in recent years, three major attempts have been made to bring managerial efficiency in the operation of public enterprises. The principal comment in the country has been that the Government has been back-seat-driving so far as the

public sector is concerned. Attempts have been made discreetly to bring a distancing process between the public enterprises management on the one hand and the Government, the Economic Ministries, on the other. There has been some effort in that direction. On whether sufficient efforts have been made and whether efforts have given results or not, I think technically the jury is still out. We do not have all the data and in any case, the gestation period has not been sufficient.

We tried the instrument MOU, Memorandum of Understanding. It is a very novel technique. It has its gaps. But it is an instrument through which we are trying to bring operating indicators and we are giving an agenda, a time-bound agenda, with the consent of the management, with the consent of both the sides, to do the business within that framework and hopefully, given the fuller play of promises in the instrument of Memoarandum of Understanding, we will get something better out of it. I know it. I am personally involved in my other capacity with the warking of the MOU. So I know the gaps. But I also know its promises. Some countries have made use of this instrument, particularly South Korea, in a very successful way. We hope that we will be able to make some progress.

The other experiment with it is the holding company. Now I have a feeling and I think there is concrete evidence for that feeling, that the Government is confused with regard to its position on holding companies. There are some sets of people in the Government who say that we should have holding companies. There are other sets who say that holding companies have failed and we have gone into a process of merry-go-round; we create holding companies and we forget about them. The Steel Authority of India is a good case. It was a holding company and today, it is not a holding company. The NTC is a holding company and the internal thinking in the Government is that this should be wound up. So I would like to say that the Government should clarify itself of these options; go into all the strengths and weaknesses, the track-records of the working of the holding companies; and come out with a fuller package which will be enduring in character. It should not give confused singls. Are you going to keep holding companies? Are you going to create new holding companies. Are you going to disband the existing holding companies? And if two companies are there, one is working better and the other is doing rather dismally, then what is common between the two which can make both of them work better than that they are doing.? So, there should be some clarity of thinking. It should not be that the Minister dreams in the night and tomorrow he has a policy and he makes an announcement; and on the next day, he has another dream and he decides that he has to forget about it. Much of such monkey business has happened in the management of the indusarial sector. I will come to some of those details if you give me time. (*Interruption*).

PROF. SAURIN BHATTACHARYA (West Bengal): Nightmare, not dream.

PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR: I will give you one illustration. That is the way the fertiliser industry has been managed; the way the reorganisation of the fertiliser industry has been done. It defies all managerial logic. All the sick units have been brought together and all the surplus staff of the sick units have been dumped there. Take the case of the Hindustan Fertilizers. The entire marketing department of the fertiliser industry has been lumped in the Hindustan Fertilisers and located in Calcutta which has nothing to do with it. I personally do not see if there is sufficient logic which is applied, if there is a managerial thinking, if the economic criteria are applied and if there has been a systematic analysis of some of those things. But you will find that there is enough to learn from our mistakes and improve upon them rather than looking for a new policy regime or that kind of things.

A lot has been talked about the worwers and their commitment and all that. We do realise that in the public sector we expected and we still continue to hope that workers work not only for the salary but because they thing that they are part of the creation of wealth for the national good. They are not doing it for the be-

[Prof. Saurin Bhattacharya]

nefit or either Morarka or anybody else. Whatever they are doing, they are doing it for their country, for India. It doesn't mean Morarka only. (*Interruptions*). They are not working for the individual. They are working for the collective good of the country. But today I should take the House into confidence that if we interact with people from among consumers' from among taxpayers, from among voters—an impression has gone round that the public sector has emerged as a kind of a body, which is more or less preoccupied with employees' concern on a priority basis rather than its customers' concern. There is nothing wrong in being employees-centred. You need to give them security, look after them but not in total divorcee or in total neglect or even relative neglect of the customers. They were covered under the provisions of the MRTP. Perhaps, initially they needed that protection. But tody, now that they are not covered, the consumers have better right to expect the delivery schedule to be met, the quality to be maintained and perhaps expect a competitive cost advantage if there is competition across the units in the production. in particular. In this situation, we still need commitment of the employees and it is here offloading of the shares and giving it to the workers becomes a relevant instrument. Several countries have tried it. If the stake of the employee is well beyond the salary and a permanent job, then there is a scope for an additional conduit for generating involvement. He is interested in the balance sheet because he has dividened income. He is interested in the balance sheet because he is interested in the capital gains of his stocks if he is trading in the market. So, the Government has been somewhat having cold feet on this as it were. For several years, It has been debated. Various Committees have gone into that. But or some reason, it has not been implemented. And this is surprising when we know several public sector enterprises are such where ownership is in the hands of public and the workers. Take petroleum industry the Cochin Refinery. 22 per cent of the shares is held by the public and the workers. Take Indo-Burma Petroleum. So there are several operating enterprises in India called public sector which are really in nature technically jointly held, where public and workers are stock-holders. I see no reason why this successful experiment within our own country should not be expanded and if it is expanded, what is the ideological struggle that is going on? If Maruti Udyog which is a jointly held company between a multi-national and an Indian company. is being identified and accepted as a public sector unit why should we not create more Maruti like enterprises in the joint sector whether it is joint between two public sector or a public sector and a private sector, a domestic private sector and an international foreign public sector or a foreign private sector. Where we can combine this marriage of two cultures, where we can bring the managerial capability or the additional capital investment or the transfer of technology or access to market. we should allow all those sources of strength in the Indian public sector. This has been an ideological constraint in this regard. (*Interruptions*)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN): Prof. Thakur. you have taken twenty minutes Please conclude.

PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR Have I? You allowed three minutes Madam.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN): You have taken three more minutes.

PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR Just last few minutes, Madam. The question has been raised, what are we going to do with the sick units. I think one thing we must be very clear about. We are not allowing them to remain sick because it helps nobody—neither the workers, nor the taxpayers nor the economy—because a large amount of critical resource is involved there not giving productive results. So we must do something with sick units. How do we do it? We have three choices. One is, close them. That should be the

last choice. The first choice should be through managerial intervention, whether through capital restructuring, technological modernisaion. better man-management, with the combination of all that, you try to turn it around and there are cases where it has been turned around successfully and they are giving good results. Secondly, if you cannot turn them around and you do not want to close them, amalgamate them, merge them with their asserts and liability with any other similar company where they can help each other rather than people being on the road and you create a lot of problem for the society and the economy as well. Now who will do that. So the Board for Industrial Financial Reconstruction is an agency which is authorised to do that from the private sector. Through an amendment we are allowing this ambit to be extended to the public sector. This is only the route, but the question arises: Is BIFR in a position to deliver? I am raising this question at the moment. My answer at the moment is, it not in a position to deliver the extent of load that is going to be devolved on it. The Chairman of the BIFR is on record where he has said he needs more power, he needs more cooperative financial institutions in order to get the job done which is agreed upon. I would like to submit that while we are taking the BIFR route, we should also take a close look on the working of the BIFR, strengthen its capability and potential and ensure support of the agencies like the Development Bank or whatever it is so that we are able to get the results that we are looking forward to. If the workers are enterprising, if they are prepared to take on the job of management and get support from the financial institutions, they should be encouraged and supported as it has taken place in cases of workers cooperatives like Kamani etc. They should be encouraged.

The last point I would like to submit is that still it leaves a problem of the surplus labour even in running enterprises as well as those units which are sick. What to do with them is a economic question it isa social question and together it can turn out to be a political question. We don't want economic efficiency with people on the roads, creating social problems because that will not be any growth worth the name. So we have to have a safety net. That is what we have to look for, modernising or restructuring with a human face and a National Renewal Fund has been created. My submission, Madam, is that sufficient thought needs to be given to the working out of the details of the National Renewal Fund, the way it is going to be implemented, the time in which it will be implemented. I would like to warn here that workers should not be treated as a set of persons who should be given the golden handshake and forgotten about. A worker is interested in a job, but his family is interested in an asset which can be held in perpetuity, which can be transferred across generations. So a mutual funds or some agency should consider the possibility of using that separation money, the golden handshake money, to absorb it and to convert it into such units which can be helped, which can be marketed, which can be transferred across generations. It should not be a consumption fund. It should be an incomegenerating asset. If somebody losses his job, and job is an income-generating asset, it must be replaced by a similar asset. And this requires some innovative thinking. To date I have no evidence to show that some such thoughts have gone on record. I would like to submit, through you. to the Government... (*Interruptions*) . . .

SHRI MENTAY PADMANABHAM (Andhra Pradesh): Closnig down sick units means you are doing large-scale retrenchment..

PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR: I have not used the word "retrenchment".

SHRI JAGESH DESAI: In case it is required.

PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR: If the surplus labour is there, you do man-management, but don't forget about the interests of the workers. It should not be at the cost of the workers. They have to be absorbed. You have to create income-generating opportunities for them. So,

[Prof. Chandresh P. Thakur]

don't forget about that where it is required.

The last point. (*Interruptions*). This is really the last. In the last point what I am saying is that all this debate in the Houses of Parliament, either in the Lower or in the Upper House where we are doing it, is directed towards the Central Government. But the real story is roughly 49 per cent public enterprises are owned by the State Government.

SHRI KAMAL MORARKA: By way of capital?

PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR: Units and investment.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN): He has already exceeded his time, Mr. Morarka. *Pleased let him finish* . . . (*Interruptions*)

PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR: Subject to correction ... (*Interruptions*) They are a bottomless pit. Most of them were created not with an economic agenda they were created with a political agenda to find work for people who could not be accommodated in the Cabinet and this applies to all political formatins. I would like to submit that the Central Government must find ways to do something with regard to this public profligacy and institutionalised incompetence in the management of the economy; otherwise, we will have to continue to pay a heavy price. Thank you. Madam, for being patient and still smiling...

SHRI KAMAL MORARKA: Madam, at the outset let me make it clear that today's discussion arises out of a very unfortunate statement made by the Finance Minister in Bangkok or Singapore or some other place that sick public sector units will be closed down. Now, let us be very clear on the subject. I have seen the discussion here. I have heard it. We have started discussing ideology, Nehruvian approach; Constitution has been quoted; industrial policy has been quoted. But all this is absolutely of no use. In the ruling party Members are suffering from pangs of conscience for deviating from the Nehruvian ideology and they feel it is better to quote Nehru, I have no objection. But let me make it clear. Prof. Thakur was the first person. When he was speaking, what at least admitted that there was a deviation though he stated that Nehruvian policy itself was dynamic and there was an in-built provision for deviation. But the funny part of it is that Mr. Ahluwalia. Mr. Bhandare and Mr. Jagesh Desai have quoted the Constitution, one of the Directive Principles being prevention of concentration of economic power, without realising that the only instrument the Congress Government created in 1970 is the Monopolies and Restrictive Trade Practices Act which Mrs. Indira Gandhi had brought and which has a chapter on concentration of economic power and this Government has repealed it by an ordinance. This session of Parliament is going to approve that ordinance.. This instrument which gives you the power to prevent concentration of economic power. you have given up. you have repealed it. You yourself feel it is out of date. Now, the Congress Members get up and say that Nehru has said. "concentration of economic power should not be there"; please spare Nehru.

The Vice-Chairman PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR) In the Chair:

I don't know which Nehru they are talking about—Jawaharalal Nehru or Arun Nehru? Please don't make gimmicks out of it. You are the Government. You have a right to follow your policy please have the courage of your conviction to follow your policy. Please don't say one thing and do another. It helps nombody. Already the country is confused. Please don't confuse the country any more. If you feel that deviation from Nehruvian policy is required, say so and do it. It is the people who will judge you on that. Please don't go on repeating things which have no meaning. You go on saying about concentration of economic power and repeal that section by an ordinance! You think that the people are fools. In this House not many people may object to what you are saying. But people of India are judging you. This will not work. So, please stop it. As I said earlier, the whole debate

has arisen out of an unfortunate statement of the Finance Minister, I don't understand that if the ruling party Members really have the views which have been expressed here today, why they do not express these views in their party forum. Is the Finance Minister not accountable to his party. Are we supposed to hear this debate and reply here without taking into congnizance what the Finance Minister has said in public fora?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR): I think that the party has already responded to that statement.

SHRI KAMAL MORARKA: Sir, you are in the Chair. I am in your hands. Party's response is not enough. Mr. Manmohan Singh is still the Finance Minister of the country. He still stands by what he has stated. Has the party censured him? Not to my knowledge. Has Mr. Manmohan Singh retracted from that statement? No, I don't understand.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: If my friend yields for a moment, I can bring to his notice that it is not once that such a statement was made by the Finance Minister and it is not for the first time that a statement was made in a foreign country. On a number of occasions the person looking after finance had been making such statements to the detriment not of the public sector but to the detriment of the political parties.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR): There distinguished Ministers are here.

SHRI KAMAL MORARKA: I am not on the technical point the statement was made here or there. Let us not run away from the problem. The central problem, Sir, which in your speech you have stated and very rightly so, is that there should not be any distinction between public sector and private sector. Ownership is not the issue. The issue is efficient management. Business has to run efficiently. A business, as I understand business, is supposed to make profit or if it is a service that service should be provided at the least cost efficiently. Now, on that touchstone this discussion is useless because you must discuss either unit by unit or at least setor by sector. If you are clubbing all public sector undertakings together, you will have to take all private sector units together, which does not happen. So, the discussion itself shows that there is some thinking in the Government to do something about the public sector as a whole. And that has caused consternation amongst the opposition parties, amongst the people at large. People have no method to show their anguish to you. Look at what we have come to. The Congress party Members while talking about workers will look to this side as if the CPI and the CPI (M) are the custodians of the workers in this country. The Congress party has abandoned its due role in socio-economic transformation. You are now looking at yourself as "we and they". The figures given here, Sir, show that most of the sick units are in West Bengal. But the hon. Member does not say that that is so because those are taken—over sick units from the Bird & Co., Jessops, Braithwaite—all erstwhile multi-nationals. Those companies had become sick that is why they have taken them over. They happened to be in West Bengal. Most of them had headquarters in West Bengal. And engineering companies were mostly in West Bengal. You will say that this unit is in West Bengal and this is a sick unit and look at CPI and CPI (M) benches as if they have made it sick. This is the kind of nonsense which is leading this country to this morass. We cannot solve these problems because we are not attacking the problems. We are busy in trying to play politics. A stage has come when the Bureau of Public Enterprises has come out with a very well-prepared document listing 58 companies which in their opinion are chronically sick. There are 98 companies which are loss-making. In their opinion these 58 companies are chronically sick and somethnig must be done about it. They have not said that they should be closed. They have given the options. Let us not misunderstand. Fifty-eight companies do not mean 58 industrial units. It means at least 200 industrial units, if not more. One company, for instance, the National Textile Corporation West Bengal has 8 textile

[Shri Kamal Morarka]

mills under it—So, 58 companies do not mean 58 units. The total number of workers in these 58 undertakings runs into half a million.

Sir, in my budget speech I had told this Government—of course, I don't agree with the route which they are taking, the IMF or the World Bank or whatever, that apart—about one mistake. I told the Finance Minister, "Don't make one mistake and that is, don't start talking of retrenchment on a large scale. If you will do that you will have to face a social problem which will wipe out your Government. Please don't think about it."

Sir, there are two type of tools in the world. One who gives advice and the second who don't take it. I am just trying to give advice. I don't think it has any effect because today the whole tenor of the discussion is, the workers must cooperate. Cooperate with what? Do you want to retrench the workers? Why are you ashamed of saying it? You are saying that we have surplus workers. Then why don't you start a dialogue with the trade unions? Why are you arfaid of facing the trade unions? This is a very funny situation. Sir, we are living in a welfare State. Unfotunately or fortunately my background is of an entrepreneur and industrialist. According to me, strike is the basic right of the workers. Sir, any attempt to stifle this right does not go with democracy. But we must have the competence to deal with the strikes. If the workers go on strick...

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: I am saying that strike is their right if they are within their rights and if they are justified.

SHRI KAMAL MORARKA: This is the 1975 emergency proclamation of the Congress with which I don't agree. The workers will decide whether it is a right time for strike, not us. It is what they think fit. We must understand them. If we are management, if we are entrepreneurs, we must talk to them. We must be able to argue with them. You cannot decide on their behalf whether they are right or wrong.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: Sir, strike should not become a fancy and the workers should not take that weapon in their hands every now and then.

SHRI KAMAL MORARKA: Sir, precisely I want to put on record that I disagree with what Mr. Narayanasamy has just now said. It is the workers' right to stop work, as he says, "every now and then." It is the workers who will decide whether it is the right time to go on strike (*Interruptions.*)

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: Sir, kindly add a word. If they are justified in their demands. (*Interruptions*). But they cannot stop the production on flimsy grounds. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI KAMAL MORARKA: I will decide what I have to speak... (*Interruptions*)...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR): Both of you know that there is the Industrial Disputes Act... (*Interruptions*)...

SHRI KAMAL MORARKA: Sir, let me put on record. This is precisely the mentality which Jawaharlal Nehru fought against—the mentality to decide the mind of the others, to decide what is a flimsy excuse. Who are you to decide that it is a flimsy excuse? If in the collective wisdom of the workers or in the wisdom of the leader whom they have elected as leader, if they decide that that issue is enough for them to go on strike, you better face the issue: I don't understand this... (*Interruptions*)...

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: Sir, I would just like to make a point. The Reserve Bank Survey has categorically stated that out of the three lakh units that are sick, only 2 per cent are because of the workers. ...(*interruptions*).

SHRI JAGESH DESAI: What about the strike... (*interruptions*)...

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: This strike was imposed upon the workers by the statement of the Finance Minister... (*Interruptions*)...

SHRI KAMAL MORARKA: Sir, I do not understand this. Why facts have to be debated heatedly? These are facts. The units have not become sick because of the non-cooperation of the workers. BIFR is under discussion, and by the way I support the move of the Government to refer the public sector to the BIFR. I support it. What is the record of the BIFR? I tell you with all the authority at my command that there is not a single unit which BIFR has found that it could not be rehabilitated because the workers were not cooperating. There are units which could not be rehabilitated because there was no market. There are units which could not be rehabilitated because the institutions did not want to put the money and here are units which could not be rehabilitated because the promoters did not want to put the money and new promoters could not be found. But there is not a single unit where the BIFR found the workers to be a stumbling block: The BIFR has not found a single unit where if there are 1000 workers, and 200 were required to be retrenched, the union has taken a dogged view that it can not be done. This has not happened. There is not even a single case of this kind. They are just trying to pass on the blame. It is an excuse. But just passing on the blame to the workers will not solve the problem.

Privatisation is one of the slogans of this Government. In this House when there was a question whether the construction of highways would be privatised, the Minister said that they were thinking of involving the private sector. Then there was thumping of the desks. When there was a question whether banks would be privatised, the Minister got up and said that there was no such proposal. Again there was thumping of the desks. Sir, I have not understood it. Is there any policy? Do they want to privatise or not to privatise? For heaven's sake, tell us... (*Interruptions*)...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR): There is no policy on thumping of desks.

SHRI KAMAL MORARKA: Sir, there is a policy on thumping of desks. Whatever the Minister says, however absurd it is, please thump the desk. I think that is the only policy that they have... (*Interruptions*)...

SHRI JAGESH DESAI: Do not say like that. It is not done... (*Interruptions*)...

SHRI KAMAL MORARKA: It is done every-day. I do not understand it. Highways may be privatised but banks will not be privatised and there was thumping of desks in both the cases. I am not trying to make fun of them. I am getting confused. (*Interruptions*)... Their action is making fun of them What can I do?... (*Interruptions*)... The only thing in this country which the Government has not yet declared as privatised, but which has become privatised on a very large scale, is the law and order situation. It is totally privatised. There are gangs operating everywhere and the police has no control. So I do not know whether in the next document law and order would also be considered for privatisation. The Government is talking of two kinds of privatisation. One policy is that the units that are sick the Government will try to turn them around, even, may think of selling them and ultimately, if these things do not work, they would close them down. Closure is a dirty word, and Mr. Vice-Chairman. Sir, you had put it very rightly when you had spoken about it that public sector units "will not be allowed to remain sick." That is what you said. The second privatisation is that 20 per cent shares of good public sector undertakings will be sold to the mutual funds. The House may not know: in 1959 32 years ago, there was a Congress Parliamentary Party Sub-Committee headed by Shri V. K. Krishna Menon ,as "left" a person as can be. That Committee recommended to the Congress Parliamentary Party that 49 per cent shares of the public sector undertakings should be sold to the public. Today, we are having an ideological discussion about whether selling 20 per cent

[Shri Kamal Morarka]

of the shares would mean dilution of equity. There is no need trying to be more loyal than the king. They will not be able to reach him despite whatever programmes they make. There is no harm in selling the shares of the public sector undertakings to the public provided the control is with the Government. No private enterpreneur or business house should get control of this. If 51 per cent share is with the Government, the Government control is total, and 49 per cent should be widely distributed. LIC is a corporation which does not function on Government funds. It is policyholders' funds. LIC, in its own wisdom, may think of investing in Tata Steel or any other private company. They can think of investing in the ONGC or Steel Authority provided that their investment Committee finds that investment worth it. It is the survival of the fittest. If the Government wants to unload its good equity shares to the public, it should be on commercial principles. You keep 51 per cent and you unload 49 per cent. Why do you need to do that? Because you are running short of cash, because your budgetary deficit has gone high. Why have they gone high? This is not the occasion to discuss about that. Just now, you need money. You sell a part of your assets which everybody does. About 58 companies are chronically sick consisting 200 or 300 units; this is a serious problem. Each unit should be examined carefully and I am sure the BIFR will do the job provided, by the Government's bungling, the BIFR is not made a sick unit. Because what are they trying to do? They appoint officials —it is a cushy job, the membership of the BIFR— who know nothing of industry. Before they revive a sick unit, BIFR itself will become a sick unit. This should not happen. The Chairman of the BIFR is a tough man. So nobody likes him. Nobody likes tough people.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR): We would like hearing you.

SHRI KAMAL MORARKA: The BIFR should consist of people with impeccable integrity and knowledge of industry. Unless that happens, they will not be able to do anything. You transfer this problem to the BIFR. But if you appoint members also are nambypammby, you can't do anything. Therefore, the Finance Minister has to see to manning BIFR correctly. There are two or three aspects which other hon. Members, particularly yourself, raised. Everything again fails down to an analysis according to their monograph itself. Out of 58 companies—it will surprise you— 46 are taken-over units. Only 12 of them were started as public sector units. It does not show that the public sector by itself is sick! In fact, the original public sector as envisaged by Jawaharlal Nehru— oil, steel, coal, ship building etc.—part of it, you are trying to privatise because you are doing well ! You decide to sell 20 per cent share because you are doing well! The oil sector is largely doing well. There are units here and there which are not doing well. But what is really doing bad is the excess baggage that you have picked up. In the 70s, there was a slogan that the public sector should go into consumer industry. You took over Modern Bakeries, Double Seven, soft drinks, running hotels, taxi services. these can't be run by even big private sector units. These are businesses which can be done in a decentralised way. Why not the Government get rid of these lines? It is for the Government to decide. But the Engineering units of Calcutta...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR): Time is running out.

SHRI KAMAL MORARKA: I hope you will show the same indulgence that the Chair showed for you.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR): That time, I was not in the Chair.

SHRI KAMAL MORARKA: What I observe is that the Engineering units mostly located in West Bengal have become a serious problem for the Department of Heavy Industry and Department of Industrial Development under whose control they come. It is necessary that all the Members support this

including the Members who are connected with the trade unions. A case by case study should be made and these units should be made viable. I am not one for privatisation. I am dead against privatising what is really valuable, namely, hotel land, in Delhi or Bombay, or ONGC or any such thing. But these units which you picked up from the private sector are not any strategic industries. They are ordinary engineering units competitive industries like many in Howrah and Sealdah which are making money. What we must ensure is we are there to protect employment. For the units which were taken over 15 year ago with the purpose of protecting employment, how does that objective become redundant today because you have no money? This is no logic. The Bureau of Public Enterprises should make a unit by unit study in the limited case as to which are the engineering units which have fallen sick and which are intractable. Private sector entrepreneurs who do not do away with the workers should be located. Another thing I have heard in this House is it is as if workers of only the public sector have to be protected. We are a welfare State and the private sector cannot get any power to hire and fire; it cannot be allowed. There is the Industrial Disputes Act. The welfare State remains. I am not using the word 'socialism' because that would be really making fun of the Congress Party because that has been jettisoned long ago. The Industrial Disputes Act still remains. The welfare State still remains. India is a welfare State. And in the framework of a welfare State we should, if possible, find a solution which will protect employment. There should be no exit policy. All associations and chambers of commerce and industry say that there should be an exit policy. There must be an exit policy for the management. Good managements must come in. The retrenchment policy is pernicious. Government should not announce or even think of any sort of a 'golden hand-shake' or whatever that is. Please don't announce any policy which gives even the psychological impression that workers are about to be thrown out of their jobs. The problems is not economic. The problem is socio-economic. The felling that in this country workers are going to be thrown out of job is going to throw the country into panic. Whatever else we may do or we may not do, I don't think we should create panic in the country saying workers are going to be thrown out of job. If there are any surplus workers in any unit, I submit, they can be phased out in five years because there will be retirements every year... (*Interruption*)

डा० रत्नाकर पाण्डेय (उत्तर प्रदेश) : उनको आप अपने कारखाने में रख लीजिये, अगर सरकार निकाले तो।

श्री अश्विनी कुमार (बिहार) : आपको भी रख लेंगे ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (प्रो० चन्द्रेश पी० ठाकुर) : बोलने दीजिये प्लीज ।

श्री कमल मोरारका : ... (व्यवधान) यह कामेंटमेंट मत कीजिए ।

श्री अश्विनी कुमार : अगर सरकार नहीं कर पाये तो आप कर देंगे..... (व्यवधान)

डा० रत्नाकर पाण्डेय : मैं इनका गुरु हूं। मैंने आज तक दक्षिणा भी नहीं लिया है इनसे ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (प्रो० चन्द्रेश पी० ठाकुर) : आशीर्वाद तो चाहिए न ।

SHRI KAMAL MORARKA: I submit that what I am worried about is, apart from any party ideology, there is a general atmosphere being created that you are going to get rid of the workers. This must be checked immediately. Whether Mr. Thungon replies or Mr. Kurien replies, I hope he will assure the House that not a single worker will be thrown out of job. Let us phase out the workers in a different way. But nobody should he thrown out of job because that itself is a very serious thing.

The last point before I conclude is that we tend to mix up matters. There

[Shri Kamal Morarka]

are a lot of suggestions in the same monograph which bureaucracy by itself will not be able to do. They need political support. For instance, the Delhi Transport Corporation. It loses Rs. 100 crores a year. The price of diesel goes up. The price of steel goes up. The price of spareparts goes up. But Delhi commuter's fare cannot go up because we are afraid of our voters in the Capital. This is not economic. This is not even fair because if the commuter in Bombay and Calcutta has to pay more, there is no reason why the commuter in Delhi should be pampered. (*Interruption*) Everything in Delhi is subsidised. And who pays for it? Ultimately it comes out here. Take fertilizer. You yourself mentioned it very kindly. On fertilizer, I do not understand when the Government is shelling out something like Rs. 6,000 crores or Rs. 8,000 crores as fertilizer subsidy which is supposed to meet the difference between the sale price and the cost, how can the company still lose? There must be a genius at work there. I feel that fertilizer is a scandal; it is not an issue. It is because the capital costs have been very high. The whole fertilizer economy has gone away and I do not know what is going to happen. The Agriculture Minister must sit down with the Industry Minister and sort things out. These are areas in which we need all-round political support because this has nothing to do with the workers. If the rates have to be raised in Delhi—my friend there need not look at this side—do it if you have got the guts. If you do not have the courage to do it, then call all the parties, discuss it, show it on the TV, and then do something about it. If you go on giving subsidies and then say that the public sector is losing, there is no point. Sit down and discuss and find out why we are losing. We are losing because we do not have the guts to do certain things. We should do them.

Similarly, with regard to the NTC, there is a proposal to amalgamate certain units, to phase out certain units, to do something unit-wise. Immediate action should be taken. Then, I do not understand the purpose of this monograph at all. Is it a document for discussion? Is it a report to the Ministry? Is it required for getting approval? In that case please give the approval instantly. There is nothing much in this. Please ask the Department to work out the details unit-wise and come out with concrete proposals and take it to the Cabinet for action. For heaven's sake give us an assuranct in this House that not one worker will be retrenched in this country. Thank you.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P. CHANDRESH THAKUR): I think some commitment was made earlier to Shri Chaturanan Mishra that he would get an early chance though his number is a little later. I think we can agree.

मिश्रा जी, आप जरा संक्षेप में अपनी बात कहिएगा ।

श्री चतुरानन मिश्र : अभी तो हमने शुरु ही नहीं की है ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (प्रो० चन्द्रेश ठाकुर) : आप अच्छा बोलते हैं और संक्षेप में बोलते हैं तो और भी अच्छा बोलते हैं ।

श्री चतुरानन मिश्र : हम बोलेंगे जहां तक हम जानते हैं । पहली बात यह है कि हम लोग जो बहस कर रहे हैं उसमें पब्लिक सेक्टर के बारे में जो कहा गया है उसमें पहली बात यह कही गयी है कि घाटा हो गया है इसलिए हम प्राइवेट सैक्टर को दे देंगे । घाटा तो सबसे ज्यादा इस सरकार को लगता है । ट्रेड में भी घाटा है, बजट में भी है, इनएफिशियेंसी भी हद से ज्यादा है । तो इसको क्या बी०आई०एफ०आर० को दे दिया जाएगा यह हम पूछना चाहते हैं ।

इस सदन में ही नहीं, सदन के बाहर भी हम मजदूर पक्ष की ओर से आपसे कहेंगे कि हम इस बात के लिए तैयार हैं कि पब्लिक सैक्टर को अच्छे ढंग से चलाने का इंतजाम किया जाए । इतना ही नहीं अभी जो स्थिति हो गई है, उसमें हम आपके साथ फुली कोआपरेट करना चाहेंगे ताकि अपनी इकोनोमी को रिस्ट्रक्चर कर सकें और वर्ल्ड में हम कंपीट करें ।

यह हम आप से कहना चाहेंगे । अगर आपको हमारे ऊपर विश्वास हो तब तो हमसे मिलकर कीजिए नहीं तो एक रास्ता और है । डालमा सीमेंट फैक्टरी में 22 मजदूर मारे गए थे गोली चलने से । तो हम आपकी सरकार से कहेंगे कि अपना पेट बड़ा कर लो ताकि मजदूरों का ज्यादा खून आपके पेट में आ सके । नहीं तो हम एक इंच नहीं बढ़ने देंगे ।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF CHANDRESH P. THAKUR): Since I have to go, may I seek the consent of the House so that I can request Mr. V. Narayanasamy, a Vice-Chairman with several years of experience, to take over? ...Yes, Mr. Narayanasamy. please come.

[The Vice-Chairman (Shri V. Narayanasamy) in the Chair]

श्री चतुरानन मिश्र : सभापति महोदय, यह सवाल उठा कि हम लोग 29 तारीख को क्यों हड़ताल पर गए थे ? क्या इस हड़ताल से कोई फायदा हमको हुआ था या नहीं, यह प्रश्न आपका जायज है । मैं आपसे संक्षेप में कहना चाहता हूं कि आपकी पालिसी के चलते क्या हो रहा है, वह देखिए । आपने काटन और यानी ऐक्सपोर्ट कर दिया और दाम बढ़ने से 73 लोग एक ही स्टेट आंध्र में भूख से मर गए जो बुनकर थे। उनको न इस हाउस ने बचाया, न किसी ने बचाया, न आपने बचाया । हम मरते रहेंगे भुखमरी से तो क्या हड़ताल करने के भी हथियार का हम इस्तेमाल नहीं करेंगे ? आपने जो काटन यार्न ऐक्सपोर्ट कर दिया उससे वह इतना महंगा हो गया कि वे लोग भूख से मर गए । इसलिए हम आपसे कहना चाहते हैं कि हमारे सामने कोई रास्ता नहीं है । आप लोग सोच रहे हैं जैसा कि माननीय सदस्यगण बोलते हैं कि वर्कर्स की छंटनी की जाए या नहीं । हम आपसे कहेंगे कि बहुत ज्यादा मजदूर हैं तो उनके रिप्लेसमेंट के लिए हय तैयार हैं । लेकिन दो साल पहले आप संविधान में राइट टु वर्क की बात कर रहे थे, एंप्लायमेंट गारन्टी स्कीम की बात कर रहे थे और आज कह रहे हैं मालिकों की राइट टु रिट्रेंचमेंट । आप कहिए कैसे हम आपके साथ सहयोग करें ? आप तुलना कर रहे हैं कि सोवियत यूनियन में क्या हुआ । हमारे मित्र वीरेन जे० शाह ने उद्धरण दिया लेकिन मैं आपसे कहना चाहता हूं कि माना उस सिस्टम में भी बहुत से दोष थे । वहां पर डेमोक्रेसी नहीं थी । हमारे यहां उससे बहुत अंतर है लेकिन एक बात उस सिस्टम में थी कि वह सबको रोजी रोटी देते थे । आपको विश्वास नहीं होगा कि न्युजवीक में यह किला है, इसको मैं बढ़कर सुनाना चाहता हूं । सुब्रहमण्यम स्वामी नहीं हैं, उनको इंटरेस्ट था, मैं आपको उसकी हैडलाइन पढ़कर सुनाता हूं—

"REFUSENIKS IN, REVERSE: Long lines, short tempers at the consulate's visa section.

BACK TO THE USSR

Soviet Jews are leaving Israel—and heading home"

रीजंस क्या हैं ? जो भी देखना चाहे वह देख सकता है । वह कह रहे हैं कि हम डॉक्टर हैं, हमको झाड़ू लगाने के लिए कहा जाता हम इंजीनियर हैं, हमसे रोड साफ करवाया जाता है । सोवियत संघ में सेबको जीविका दी जाती थी । लेकिन गोरबाचौव की ही तरह आप भी सोचते हैं तो आप स्वतंत्र हैं । लेकिन आप भारी गलती करेंगे । हमारे पास विशाल आबादी है, खाने को नहीं है, जीवन में आशा नहीं है तो वह ए०के० 47 राइफल का ही सहारा लेगा । आप समय रहते चेतेंगे तो आपको पता लगेगा कि कितनी भयंकर स्थिति है ।

डा० रत्नाकर पाण्डेय : आप आए आप नहीं चला पाए, आपको समर्थन दिया, सेब कुछ देकर भी आप नहीं चला पाए तो हमको फिर आना पड़ा ।...

श्री चतुरानन मिश्र : यही फर्क है । उस समय हम कांस्टीट्यूशन में संशोधन करना चाहते थे, तत्काल रोजी के अधिकार को मूल अधिकार बनाना चाहते थे । लेकिन आप आए हैं तो रोज ऐक्जिट

[श्री चतुरानन मिश्र]

पालिसी बनेगी, रोज हमको कहते हैं। हमको अमरीका का अनुभव मत सिखलाए। अमरीका का कोई पक्षधर इस समय यहां पर नहीं है जिनको मैं कहता, लेकिन वहां पर 2 करोड़ 35 लख लोग फूड स्टाम्प सरकारी रिलीफ पर रहते है। यह न्यूज भी मैं आपको पढ़कर सुनाता। इसीलिए मैं आपसे कहना चाहता हूं कि इस परिस्थिति की गंभीरता पर विचार कीजिए। अगर हमारे पास धन नहीं है तो पब्लिक सेक्टर का काम भी प्राइवेट सेक्टर करे से जितना हमारी योजना में कुल रुपये हैं जितना हम लगा देंगे। इसके अलावा हमारे पास नहीं है तो रखांगी क्षेत्र आकर काम करें हमको उसमें कोई ऐतराज नहीं है, वे आकर काम कर सकते हैं। लेकिन एक बात हम जरुर कहना चहते हैं कि जब पब्लिक सेक्टर कमांडिंग हाइट पर था तभी तो इतनी बड़ी राशि में आपने सरकारी खजाने में सीधा दान में दे दिया ऐंटी पावर्टी स्कीमों में। जिससे लाखों लोग गरीबी रेखा से ऊपर आए। यद्यपि भयंकर परिस्थिति है तथापि प्राइवेट सेक्टर वैसा नहीं कर

6 p.m. सकता। मैं उदाहरण देता हूं। अगर एफ०सी०आई० न रहे बावजूद तमाम भ्रष्टाचार के जैसा कि वर्ल्ड बैंक ने बहुत पहले कहा था कि एफ०सी०आई० को हटा दीजिए तो अगर हम हटा देंगे तो अन्न पर जो आत्मनिर्भरता है वह समाप्त हो जायेगी। कोई नहीं रोक सकता, प्राईवेट सेक्टर नहीं रोकेगा। प्राइवेट सेक्टर तो मुनाफ़ाखोरी करता है। आप सरकारी गोदामों से देते हैं तब भी वह मुनाफाखोरी करता है इसलिए प्राइवेट सेक्टर नही कर सकता। अगर आप दोहरायेंगेतो सिर फूटेगा। **(व्यवधान)**

SHRI MAHENDRA PRASAD (Bihar): You are talking about FCI?

SHRI CHATURANAN MISHRA: I am talking about the Food Corporation of India.

SHRI MAHENDRA PRASAD: Not about the Fertilizer Corporation of India?

SHRI CHATURANAN MISHRA: No. I can talk about that also.

मैं दूसरी बात बता रहा हूं कि प्राइवेट सेक्टर ने जितनी बिल्डिंग बनाई हैं और सरकार ने जितनी बिल्डिंगें बनाई हैं दोनों का रेंट कम्पेयर कर लीजिए कि किसका क्या रेट है। आप गरीबों को घर देना चाहेंगे या नहीं ? जिन को आप घर नहीं देंगे तो वह आपको क्यों रहने देगा। वह बगावत नहीं करते हैं क्योंकि दबे हुए हैं। इसी तरह से मैं आपको बताना चाहूंगा कि जितनी गरीब विरोधी योजना थी कोई प्राइवेट सेक्टर नहीं चला सकता। आप ले आइये न्यूयार्क बैंक को या कहिये उससे कि चीप इलेक्ट्रिसिटी दे। आप कहिये उनको बिजली बोर्ड बनाने के लिए, हम तैयार हो जायेंगे। वे सस्ती नहीं दे सकते। इस देश के 52 परसेंट आफ दी पापुलेशन मारीजनल फार्मर्स, स्माल फार्मर्स को सस्ता इरीगेशन रेट नहीं देंगे तो वह कभी ऊपर नहीं उठेगा। नहीं उठेगा तो आप को क्यों बैठने देगा। इसीलिए पब्लिक सेक्टर एज ए होल उसको डिनाई मत कीजिए। नेहरु जी ने क्या किया या नहीं किया यह अलग बात है। आजकल नेहरु जी का नाम लेने से बहुत लोगों को बुखार चढ़ जाता है। क्यों हम बुखार चढ़ायें। हम चाहते हैं वह स्वस्थ रहें। मैं आप से कहना चाहता हूं... **(समय की घंटी)** मुझे थोड़ा समय और दे दीजिए। जिसके बारे में हज सवाल उठा है तो पब्लिक सेक्टर के रहते क्यों गरीबी बरकरार रही ! पब्लिक सेक्टर गरीबों के हित के लिए नहीं चलाया गया। हमने इस बात की कोशिश नहीं की हम ऐसी बिजली जनरेट करें कि उसका पी०एल०एफ० इतना हाई हो ताकि गरीब लोगों को बिजली मिल सके। आप लोग गांव में पांच को बिजली दे देते हैं और कहते हैं कि बिलेज इज इलेक्ट्रीफाइड। ऐसा क्यों करते हैं ? किसको धोखा देना चाहते हैं। पब्लिक सेक्टर ने उनके लिए काम नहीं किया इसलिए गरीबी बढ़ती गयी। मैं आपको बहुत उदाहरण दे सकता हूं लेकिन घंटी बज गई। मैं जिस बात की चर्चा करना चाहता हूं वह यह है कि आप जो नीति चला रहे हैं वह ठीक नहीं है। एक रोज मैंने चर्चा की थी कि जो इंडिया की 650 कम्पनियां हैं उनका प्राइवेट नेट

प्रोफिट 25 परसेंट बढ़ गया । हमारी भुखमरी होगी और वह अपना ढेर मुनाफा कमायेंगे । आपकी पोलिसी है जैसे पहले था कि ऋणम् कृतवा घृतम् पिवेत और अब हो गया है ऋणम् कृतवा पामोलीन पिवेत । यहां पामोलीन पिलायेंगे वह भी कर्जा लेकर । कर्जे की क्या हालत हो गई है कि 1995–96 तक 7 मिलियन डालर सिर्फ इन्टरेस्ट/इंस्टालमेंट में देना पड़ेगा और हमारा देश बंधक बन जायेगा । अभी ही औद्योगिक प्रगति माइनस एक परसेंट है । यह आप सब लोग जानते हैं । मैं जिस बात की चर्चा करना चाहता हूं वह यह है कि जिस वर्ल्ड बैंक को आप देवता समझते हैं उस की रिपोर्ट में "There is an increasing concern that without shifting the Indian agriculture to new areas..."

जब तक नये एरिया में नहीं जायेंगे, ग्रीन रेवोलूशन जिस क्षेत्र में हुई है, उसे भी नहीं चला सकेंगे । इसीलिए मैं आपसे कहना चाहूंगा कि जो सब्सीडीज आप देते हैं, वर्ल्ड बैंक की रिपोर्ट से पढ़ रहा हूं : "Half of the subsidy goes to the inefficient domestic fertilizer industry."

आप हम को नहीं देते हैं उनको दे देते हैं। हम कहते हैं कि गरीबों को अगर दें तो वह उठ गया होता । देश की तरक्की हो जाती । मैं आपसे कह रहा था कि आखिर इसका अंजाम क्या होगा । अगर पब्लिक सेक्टर के कुछ यूनिट बीमार हैं तो इनका क्या करें ? कुछ लोगों के मुंह से लार टपक रही है उसको प्राइवेट सेक्टर के हाथ बेचने के लिए । बजट क्या है ? कम कीमतों में गरीबों से, किसानों से लैंड एक्वायर कर ली गई । उस वक्त में दो सौ, चार सौ रुपयों में हो गया, लेकिन आज उसका वेल्यूएशन बहुत ज्यादा हो गया है । अब सरकार क्या करती है ? उसको बेचने के लिए और उसमें नफा कमाने के लिए कुछ लोग कूद रहे हैं । यही राज है ।

SHRI JAGESH DESAI: In that case, that should be given to the public sector only.

श्री चतुरानन मिश्र : यह तो गवर्नमेंट के हाथ में है । आपकी ही गवर्नमेंट को इस ढंग से काम करना चाहिए ।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY): Kindly try to be brief because your time was only five minutes. You may take two minutes more and finish.

श्री चतुरान मिश्र : हम बी०एफ० आई०आर० के क्यों खिलाफ हैं ? हम बी०एफ०आई०आर० के खिलाफ इसलिए नहीं हैं कि वह कोई विदेशी संस्था है । यह बात नहीं है । बहुत टाइम लग जाता है । बी0एफ0आई0आर0 1985 में बना और तब उसको कितने केस दिये गये ?

1382 references were made. Out of these, 353 were rejected after initial enquiry. After hearing, 175 cases were dismissed as not maintainable.

उसमें हालत यह है कि वे मैनटेन नहीं हो सके । 661 में ओपरेटिंग एजेंसीज एपान्ट की गई । उसके बाद रिवाइवल में 182 स्कीम्स बनाई गई । बी०आई०एफ०आर० व्यवहार में बंदीकरण बोर्ड साबित हो रहा है । वह एक भी कारखाना अभी तक चालू नहीं करा सका इन सात वर्षों में। इसलिए मैं आपके सामने एक विकल्प रखता हूं और वह विकल्प यह है कि मजदूरों की भी यह इच्छा हैकि वे नौकरी मे रहें । आप सरकार के लोग हैं, आपके पास सभी टेलेन्ट मौजूद है । आप जांच कीजिये और स्कीम बनाइये कि ये प्रोफिट और एफिसियन्सी से कैसे रन करें । इसके लिए कालबद्ध योजना बना लें लेकिन जिस तरह से सरकार इनको चलाती है वह ठीक नहीं है । हमारे मजदूर घाटा नहीं कर रहे हैं । मैं आपको एग्जाम्पल देना चाहता हूं । एच०एस०सी०एल० का नाम लेना चाहता हूं । हिन्दुस्तान स्टील कंस्ट्रक्शन ने लीबिया में भारत सरकार के कहने के मुताबिक काम किया । लेकिन उनका 130 करोड़ रुपया अभी भी बकाया है । उसको वापस नहीं हो रहा है । उसके चलते उनको 48 करोड़ का इंटेरेस्ट देना पड़ रहा है । ऐसे में वह सिक नहीं हो क्या होगा ?

Now, take coal. We are purchasing coking coal from other countries at the rate of 66 dollars per tonne. It amounts to more than Rs. 2500 per tonne.

[श्री चतुरानन मिश्र]

उस कोकिंग कोयले का हमारे देश में कहते हैं कि पांच सौ और छः सौ से ज्यादा नहीं देंगे। ऐसी स्थिति में हमारे पब्लिक सेक्टर घाटे में रन करेंगे या नहीं करेंगे? विदेशों से मंगाने में कुछ लोगों को कमीशन मिल जाता है। हम उनके हाथ-पांव तो नहीं तोड़ देंगे। यह तो सरकार का काम है कि उसे देखें। इस संबंध में अनेक उदाहरण दे सकता हूं।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY): You have taken 15 minutes so far. Kindly give only your points and finish.

श्री चतुरानन मिश्र : हमारा विशाखापट्टम का स्टील प्लान्ट है। It is one of the best in the country in energy efficiency.

लेकिन आप उसको रुपया नहीं देते हैं जिससे कि उसके प्रोजेक्ट्स पूरे हो जायें। इसलिए वह घाटे में चल रहा है। I can give you many examples.

बहुत से माननीय सदस्यों ने फर्टिलाइजर की चर्चा की। फर्टिलाइजर्स क्या हैं? नेहरु जी के जमाने में कोई भी फारन कन्ट्री हमको टेक्नोलोजी देने के लिए तैयार नहीं थी, लेकिन उन्होंने इसको इटली से प्राप्त किया। कोई मोन्टी कटनी कम्पनी है, उसने आउट डेटेड प्लान्ट दिया और उसने कभी अपनी केपेसिटी पर काम नहीं किया। इस तरह से परमानेन्ट लौस हो गया। आज नेहरु जी को लाख गाली दीजिये, लेकिन सच्ची बात यही थी। पहले जमाने में अमेरिका, जर्मनी और दूसरे ब्रिटेन आदि देश टैक्नोलोजी देने के लिए तैयार नहीं थे। आप आज नेहरु जी को गाली दे रहे हैं। कोई आपको रोकता नहीं है। लेकिन वस्तु-स्थिति को समझना चाहिए कि किन कारणों से यह बात हो गई। आखिर मैं आपसे एक बात कहना चाहता हूं और विनय करूंगा कि आज जिस ढंग से सरकार की तरफ से प्रचार किया जा रहा है, जिस ढंग से आप कह रहे हैं कि प्राइवेट सेक्टर कोई गोड है और सब की दवा प्राइवेट सेक्टर है, लेकिन हम प्राइवेट सेक्टर को जानते हैं। जो सबसे ज्यादा टैक्स इवेजन करता है हम यह भी जानते हैं कि प्राइवेट सेक्टर अडलट्रेशन करने में फर्स्ट है। हम प्राइवेट सेक्टर को जानते हैं जहां सबसे ज्यादा ब्लेकमनी जनरेट हो रही है। हम प्राइवेट सेक्टर को जानते हैं जो इस देश की सम्पत्ति दूसरे देश में फेंक जमा कर देता है। अगर इन चारों का कोई रास्ता आप निकाल सकें और हम समझते हैं कि रास्ता यही हो सकता है कि जो धन हमारे वित्तीय संस्थानों ने दिये हुए हैं उसको इक्वीटी में बदल दिया जाए और कंपनी बोर्ड में हमारा रिप्रजन्टेटिव रहे। अभी मैंने आपसे कहा कि वे सब चीजों का दाम बढ़ा देते हैं। आप यहां से टैक्स रिलीफ दे देते हैं अपने बजट भाषण में पर वह कभी भी कंज्यूमर्स के पास प्राइवेट सेक्टर से नहीं जाता है। तो इसका क्या इलाज है? इसीलिए हम आपसे कहना चाहते हैं कि आप इस पर सम्यक रूप से विचार करें, हम कोआपरेट करने के लिये तैयार हैं। लेकिन अगर आप कहेंगे कि हम अपना भैंसा कुल्हाड़ी से नाथेंगे तो हम भी आपका मुकाबला करेंगे और मैंने आपको बता दिया कि यह आप के लिये खैरियत वाली स्थिति नहीं है। यही कहने के लिये मैं आया हूं और मैं समझता हूं कि सरकार हम लोगों की बात पर विचार करेगी और कोई सम्यक रास्ता निकालेगी जिससे कि इसका समाधान हो सके।

ALLOCATION OF TIME FOR DISPOSAL OF GOVERNMENT LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY): I have to inform Members that the Business Advisory Committee, at its meeting held today, the 19th December, 1991, allotted time for